DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 350 379 UD 028 905

AUTHOR	Gittleman, Mark
TITLE	Chapter 1 Program Improvement and Innovation across the States. An Overview and State Profiles.
INSTITUTION	Council of Chief State School Officers, Washington, D.C.; National Association of State Coordinators of Compensatory Education, Middletown, CT.
PUB DATE	92
NOTE	212p.; For a related report, see ED 339 763.
PUB TYPE	Statistical Data (110) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE	MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	*Compensatory Education; Disadvantaged Youth; Educational Change; Educational Innovation; Elementary Secondary Education; Federal Legislation; *Federal Programs; Geographic Distribution; National Surveys; *Profiles; Program Descriptions; *Program Improvement; Public Policy; School Restructuring; State Programs; State Surveys
IDENTIFIERS	Education Consolidation Improvement Act Chapter 1

ABSTRACT

This publication presents compilations and an overview of state profiles describing Chapter 1 program improvement and innovation efforts across the states. Chapter 1 is a provision of the federal Hawkins-Stafford Elementary and Secondary School Improvement Amendments of 1988. This report reviews key aspects of implementation of the 1988 Amendments on a state-by-state basis for all 50 states, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico. Following an introduction and highlights of the publication, an overview section presents a detailed argument for supporting the full implementation and funding of the 1988 Amendments by discussing state and local standards, state technical assistance to schools, coordination with regular classrooms and successful models, existing program improvement, joint plans, funding, schoolwide projects, and statewide coordination. The bulk of the report consists of reports for each state that contain the following data: (1) tabulated data representing the Chapter 1 participation and funding summary (participation levels in school year 1990-91, Chapter 1 services by grade span in school year 1990-91, and state funding levels by school year) and the Chapter 1 program improvement summary (the number of schools in program improvement in school year 1991-92 and statewide minimum standards for improvement); (2) a description of Chapter 1 program improvement; (3) an outline of additional Chapter 1 innovation and reform efforts; and (3) an overview of ways of making a difference school by school (description of one successful schoolwide project in the respective state). Included are 11 references and 2 data tables in 2 appendixes. (JB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

COUNCIL OF CHIEF STATE SCHOOL OFFICERS

ED350379

CHAPTER 1

PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT *and* INNOVATION ACROSS THE STATES

1992

CE 028 805

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN OTHER THAN PAPER COPY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J P Goldman
Council of Chief State School Officers

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CHAPTER • 1

PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT *and* INNOVATION ACROSS THE STATES

An Overview and State Profiles

Council of Chief State School Officers

National Association of State Coordinators of Compensatory Education

Contents

Introduction ____ 1
Highlights ____ 2
Overview ____ 4
References ____ 15
Appendix 1 ____ 16
Appendix 2 ____ 17
Alabama ____ 20
Alaska ____ 24
Arizona ____ 27
Arkansas ____ 31
California ____ 34
Colorado ____ 38
Connecticut ____ 43
Delaware ____ 47
District of Columbia ____ 49
Florida ____ 52
Georgia ____ 57
Hawaii ____ 62
Idaho ____ 65
Illinois ____ 69
Indiana ____ 74
Iowa ____ 81
Kansas ____ 83
Kentucky ____ 86
Louisiana ____ 91
Maine ____ 95
Maryland ____ 99
Massachusetts ____ 103
Michigan ____ 108
Minnesota ____ 112
Mississippi ____ 115
Missouri ____ 118
Montana ____ 120
Nebraska ____ 123
Nevada ____ 126
New Hampshire ____ 129
New Jersey ____ 132
New Mexico ____ 136
New York ____ 139
North Carolina ____ 143
North Dakota ____ 146
Ohio ____ 149
Oklahoma ____ 153
Oregon ____ 156
Pennsylvania ____ 159
Puerto Rico ____ 163
Rhode Island ____ 166
South Carolina ____ 169
South Dakota ____ 173
Tennessee ____ 176
Texas ____ 178
Utah ____ 181
Vermont ____ 185
Virginia ____ 189
Washington ____ 192
West Virginia ____ 197
Wisconsin ____ 200
Wyoming ____ 206

Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO)

The Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) is a nationwide non-profit organization of the 57 public officials who head departments of public education in the fifty states, five U.S. extra-state jurisdictions, the District of Columbia, and the Department of Defense Dependents Schools. It has functioned as an independent national council since 1927 and has maintained a Washington office since 1948. CCSSO seeks its members' consensus on major education issues and expresses their views to civic and professional organizations, to federal agencies, to Congress, and to the public.

Because the Council represents each state's chief education administrator, it has access to the educational and governmental establishment in each state and to the national influence that accompanies this unique position. CCSSO forms coalitions with many other education organizations and is able to provide leadership for a variety of policy concerns that affect elementary and secondary education. Thus, CCSSO members are able to act cooperatively on matters vital to the education of America's young people.

The CCSSO Office of Federal-State Relations helps the states to advise Congress and government agencies about education issues. Staff members work closely with chief state school officers, federal liaison representatives, and other state education agency (SEA) staff to improve communications between SEAs and the federal government, and to strengthen and clarify the state role in federal education legislation.

Werner Rogers (Georgia), *President*
Bill Honig (California), *President-Elect*
Gordon M. Ambach, *Executive Director*
Carnie Hayes, *Director of Federal-State Relations*

One Massachusetts Avenue, N.W.
Suite 700
Washington, DC 20001
(202) 408-5505

National Association of State Coordinators of Compensatory Education (NASCCE)

The National Association of State Coordinators of Compensatory Education (NASCCE) is an organization of state coordinators, directors, and managers of compensatory education founded in 1972 with the primary goals of providing a vehicle for the exchange of ideas among the various states and serving as the official body representing the general wishes, desires, opinions and needs of the state coordinators of compensatory education.

Milton Matthews (Mississippi), *President*
Mike Hughes (Arizona), *Chairman, Program Improvement Commmittee*

Acknowledgements

In February of 1992 the Council of Chief State School Officers surveyed the state coordinators of compensatory education on implementation of key Chapter 1 provisions of the Hawkins-Stafford Elementary and Secondary School Improvement Amendments of 1988 (Public Law 100-297). The survey was designed jointly by staff of the Council of Chief State School Officers and members of the Program Improvement Committee of the National Association of State Coordinators of Compensatory Education.

The survey responses, which serve as the basis for the report, were submitted by the state coordinators of compensatory education on behalf of their chief state school officers. We would like to thank the state coordinators, who have been besieged with surveys in preparation for reauthorization of Chapter 1, for taking valuable time to complete our survey and in many cases provide follow-up information by phone. Responses to the survey were received from 50 states, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico, all of which are profiled in the report.

Mark Gittleman, Legislative Associate in the CCSSO Office of Federal-State Relations was the primary author of the report and directed the survey and reporting activities under the direction of Carnie Hayes, Director of Federal-State Relations, and Gordon Ambach, CCSSO Executive Director. Patti Schmid, Legislative Staff Assistant in the office of Federal-State Relations, provided extensive assistance in administering the survey and reporting activities, and editing the state profiles. Cynthia Brown, Director of the CCSSO Resource Center on Educational Equity, and Barbara Clements, Assistant Director of the CCSSO State Education Assessment Center, provided general advice and reviewed parts of the survey and reporting. Interns, Chadwick Clapsaddle and Pamela Rubin, assisted in compiling and analyzing the survey information. Paula Delo, Director of Public Information, produced the publication.

Introduction

The Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO), in conjunction with the National Association of State Coordinators of Compensatory Education (NASCCE), is pleased to present this compilation and overview of state profiles describing Chapter 1 program improvement and innovation efforts across the states.

With a fiscal year 1992 appropriation of $6.7 billion and services provided to 5.5 million at-risk children in the 1990-91 school year, Chapter 1 represents by far the single largest federal commitment to elementary and secondary education. When created as Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) of 1965, the program became the centerpiece of federal involvement in K-12 education. Over the last twenty-seven years there have been a number of significant changes to the program, but the goal has remained the same: to help disadvantaged children perform better in school. Toward that goal, the Hawkins-Stafford Amendments of 1988 made some of the most dramatic changes in the history of the program.

A new system of accountability was established that required minimum performance standards for each school district receiving Chapter 1 assistance and a program improvement process for schools that do not meet the standards. Under this system, schools identified as needing improvement are required to develop program improvement plans with technical assistance and support from state education agencies (SEAs) and the local districts in which the schools are located. The districts and schools are given up to one year for planning and must demonstrate improved performance within two school years after initial identification or they must develop and implement joint program improvement plans with SEAs.

The Hawkins-Stafford Amendments of 1988 also included provisions to enable schools with very high concentrations of children in poverty to undertake schoolwide projects more easily. Under schoolwide authority, eligible schools are not required to target services only to children deemed eligible for Chapter 1. Instead, these schools can use Chapter 1 funds for broader school improvement efforts as long as they ensure improvement in the performance of the Chapter 1 eligible children.

Several important studies will report on various aspects of the 1988 Hawkins-Stafford implementation through national data analysis or in-depth coverage of select states or school districts. Additionally, the United States Department of Education regularly reports national implementation data to Congress.

This report reviews key aspects of implementation of the 1988 amendments on a state-by-state basis for all fifty states, the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico. The report is designed to provide policymakers with a qualitative as well as quantitative understanding of Chapter 1 implementation in the states. CCSSO also seeks to document the effort the states are putting into Chapter 1 program improvement and the importance of connecting Chapter 1 to broader school improvement initiatives at the state, local, and national levels. We hope that this report will help inform the work of Congress in considering further, critical funding increases for Chapter 1 and in preparing for the reauthorization of Chapter 1 in 1993.

It is important to clarify that this report does not represent CCSSO recommendations on reauthorization of Chapter 1. CCSSO has a formal Hawkins-Stafford Task Force consisting of chief state school officers, state Chapter 1 coordinators, and other program administrators, which will develop recommendations for Congress on all Hawkins-Stafford programs, including Chapter 1. In addition, CCSSO staff serve on the independent Commission on Chapter 1 that is developing reauthorization recommendations independent of the organizations with which its members are affiliated.

Highlights

In the 1990-91 school year, Chapter 1 supported supplemental instruction for approximately 5.5 million low-achieving children in low-income schools. With a funding level of $6.7 billion for the 1992-93 school year, Chapter 1 represents, by far, the largest federal commitment to elementary and secondary education.

Chapter 1 Program Improvement

- After three full years of implementation, state education agencies and local school districts in every state have implemented systems for identifying and assisting low-performing schools served by Chapter 1 in order to help the schools improve student performance.
- Approximately ten percent of the nation's elementary and secondary schools, totaling 11,720, were in various stages of program improvement as of February 1992 (See Appendix 1).
- A total of 1,481 schools were in the joint planning phase, in which assistance for program improvement becomes the joint responsibility of the state education agency and the local school district(See Appendix 1).
- Program improvement is helping to bring about changes at the school, local, and state levels for educating at-risk children. Results of program improvement include: in-service training for teams of school and district staff; improved coordination between the Chapter 1 program and the regular classroom; implementation of more effective instructional strategies; and stronger school improvement linkages between state education agencies, local districts, and schools.
- The program improvement process, as with any bold experiment, has flaws that need to be addressed. The greatest predicament for many states and localities has been the federally required system of measuring educational progress using gains on norm-referenced standardized tests. Many states and localities would prefer to move toward use of other assessments that better measure learning and more accurately identify schools in need of improvement. There is considerable discussion about changing this aspect of the program during the 1993 reauthorization.
- Funding increases for program improvement and state administrative costs are critical. State education agency responsibilities have increased substantially without a commensurate increase in resources. New responsibilities include ensuring proper identification of schools, providing assistance in developing and implementing local program improvement plans, and offering specialized assistance to schools undertaking joint plans. These critical efforts are supported almost entirely by state administrative funds, which are inadequate for the level of technical assistance needed.

Schoolwide Projects

- Hawkins-Stafford provisions for schoolwide projects are giving schools with high concentrations of disadvantaged students the flexibility needed to restructure learning and teaching throughout the school.
- State education agencies report an approximate 130 percent increase in the number of schools undertaking schoolwide projects from the 1989-90 school year to the 1991-92 school year. Approximately, twenty-seven percent of the eligible schools undertook schoolwide projects in the 1991-92 school year.
- States report that schoolwide projects have led to a variety of changes in class size, instruction, school organization, parent involvement, the coordination of education and social services, the use of computer-assisted instruction, and opportunities for professional development.
- State education agencies have encouraged eligible schools to consider undertaking schoolwide projects. Where education funding is declining at the state or local level, however, schools hesitate to undertake schoolwide projects because of the requirement to maintain state and

local funding at 100 percent from year to year. Additionally, schools currently operating schoolwide projects in these states and/or localities are concerned that they will have to terminate their schoolwide projects if fiscal effort cannot be maintained. As of mid-July 1992, Congress was considering legislation to change the schoolwide project maintenance of effort requirement.

Statewide Coordination

- Most states are implementing statewide school improvement programs, and in various ways, Chapter 1 is being coordinated with these statewide efforts.
- A number of states are coordinating their Chapter 1 activities with other federal programs, such as Chapter 2 and the Eisenhower Math and Science program, in order to maximize the benefits of federal funding.
- Nineteen states report that they operate state compensatory programs similar to Chapter 1. In most states, Chapter 1 and the state compensatory education program are very closely aligned and the programs are often run by the same personnel at the state and local levels.
- With regard to the coordination of both federal and state programs, there are efforts across the states to coordinate programs better through consolidated monitoring, applications, and operations, and the elimination of unnecessary data collection.
- While states are prohibited by law from mandating the expenditure of Chapter 1 funds for early childhood education, most states actively encourage it. In the average state, over 50 percent of Chapter 1 services are provided to young children in preschool through grade 3 programs.
- States are disseminating federal criteria and in some cases state policy guidance on issues of appropriate Chapter 1 services to limited English proficient children and children with disabilities. A few states report strategies on more comprehensive coordination or blending of categorical programs under existing federal regulations.

Note: The state reports from which these highlights are drawn were based on a CCSSO February 1992 survey and follow-up phone interviews with state coordinators of compensatory education.

Overview

Chapter 1 Program Improvement

Leveraging Accountability and Higher Performance

CCSSO strongly supported authorization of provisions for program improvement in the Hawkins-Stafford School Improvement Amendments. We support their implementation, full funding, and expansion for these reasons:

- The provisions put the emphasis of Chapter 1 on student performance on a school-by-school basis.
- Program improvement provides a positive, ongoing accountability system for the largest federal elementary and secondary education program. Schools identified as needing improvement are targeted for special attention and tangible assistance from the local district and the state to ensure that student performance improves.
- Program improvement identifies the schools most in need of assistance, enabling state and local education agencies (SEAs and LEAs) to bring promising practices to those schools, and in turn, raise expectations and performance at schools across the entire school district.
- Program improvement draws the state and localities together in a joint endeavor toward effective performance enabling each state, local district, and school to set goals and assess progress for educationally disadvantaged students.

As concluded in the Interim Report of the Chapter 1 Implementation study, ". . . the program improvement process has great potential for focusing corrective action in poorly performing schools. When districts and schools believe that the designation of needing improvement is accurate, activities are typically undertaken."

The nation has now completed the third school year of full implementation of the Hawkins-Stafford amendments and program improvement. The start-up of program improvement was difficult in many places. In each state, objective criteria for selecting schools, timelines, and due process procedures had to be developed by the SEA and reviewed by the Committee of Practitioners. Once schools were identified for improvement, the states had to have a system in place for providing technical assistance to school and district staff in the development and implementation of program improvement plans.

With commitment and high expectations, the states are implementing program improvement and the new provisions to promote innovation; however, the states are also experiencing frustration accompanying the enormous challenge of systemically improving the performance of 5.5 million at-risk children using the limited resources available.

State and Local Standards for Improvement

In the Hawkins-Stafford Amendments, Congress defined "no improvement or a decline in aggregate student achievement" as the criterium for identifying a school in need of improvement. The United States Department of Education interpreted this statutory provision to mean zero or less normal curve equivalent (NCE) gains on standardized tests, and encouraged state and local education agencies to set higher aggregate achievement standards than the federal minimum.

The NCE standard, however, is not the only standard that local districts must use to identify schools for improvement; the statute and regulations specify that local applications must establish "desired outcomes" for Chapter 1 projects and identify as needing improvement any school not making "substantial progress" toward these outcomes. At a minimum, the desired outcomes can be stated in terms of aggregate performance; however, local districts are strongly encouraged to develop other desired outcomes that are specifically related to their Chapter 1 programs and not based on a norm-referenced standardized test.

Statewide Minimum Standards for Improvement

For the first year of implementation, most states adopted the national minimum improvement standard of an NCE gain greater than zero as the statewide minimum standard for aggregate student achievement. Since the first year of implementation, fifteen states have raised their minimum NCE standards.

Many states have also required the establishment of desired outcomes not based on NCEs and in some cases have set minimum requirements for these outcomes in alignment with statewide school improvement efforts. In Arizona, for example, the State Department of Education requires that desired outcomes set by the school district be validated by results of the state performance-based test. Beginning in the 1993 school year, all Chapter 1 programs in the state must have at least one desired outcome that evaluates, consistent with the Arizona Student Assessment Plan, the student's mastery of the State Board of Education's listing of Essential Skills.

Several points need to be emphasized about the process for setting statewide standards.

- In the first years of implementation, states were unsure about the number of schools that would be identified for program improvement by use of a given NCE standard and were therefore cautious in setting NCE standards higher than the federal minimum due to very limited resources with which to assist schools once they were identified for improvement.
- Federal regulations require each state to consult with its Committee of Practitioners before rulemaking. These committees have, in many cases, discouraged higher statewide standards.
- On a practical level, the law and regulations limited the states' ability to use alternative performance standards in place of aggregate achievement on standardized tests. The State of Connecticut, for example, sought a statewide standard based on a statewide core curriculum as measured by an alternative assessment. Federal regulations, however, do not allow alternative measures in lieu of the required norm-referenced measure. The only allowable means of using alternative measures is to correlate them with norm-referenced tests. Alternative measures, however, are often not designed to produce norm-referenced data or to report data on an annual basis, and changing tests to meet these requirements is frequently impractical and undesirable.
- As Chapter 1 reauthorization nears, states and Committees of Practitioners are hesitant to become more dependent on a standard based on an NCE testing system when activity in the states and national dialogue on assessment is headed in other directions.

Statewide Assistance Setting Local Desired Outcomes

Where there has been resistance to higher statewide standards, states have succeeded in encouraging some local districts to adopt higher standards on a district-by-district basis in terms of NCE gains or achievement of other desired outcomes.

SEA assistance to local districts in developing desired outcomes is provided in conjunction with Technical Assistance Center (TAC) workshops, written guides that include suggestions and examples of other desired outcomes, and on-site visits by Chapter 1 staff or consultants. The Maine Department of Education uses an innovative approach which pairs districts and schools planning similar programs so that the pairs can collaborate on the development of desired outcomes.

While schools are primarily identified for program improvement through the federally-mandated evaluation model based on NCE gains, states report substantial interest at the local as well as at the state level in assessing the success of Chapter 1 programs by setting other desired outcomes and measuring progress toward achieving them. These other outcomes include success on criterion-referenced tests and performance-based tests, such as portfolios and writing samples; increased promotion rates; higher attendance; and reduced dropout rates.

There are substantial obstacles, however, to setting effective local performance goals for Chapter 1 programs and measuring achievement. First, standard setting and the use of alternative assessments are new to many local districts, where there is limited capacity for these activities and for the data management required to measure student progress. Second, the federal requirement that other desired outcomes be supplemental to the nationally mandated evaluation model reduces the incentive to establish effective other kinds of desired outcomes. State reports indicate that many localities see the dual set of standards as a form of "double jeopardy" because even if sound, measurable performance goals are set and achieved, schools may still be identified for program improvement because of aberrations in required NCE measurements.

As a result of these obstacles, the process of setting effective desired outcomes at the local level is still in its formative stage in most school districts and will require substantial increases in technical assistance to make significant progress.

Statewide Technical Assistance to Schools Identified for Program Improvement

Once identified for improvement, schools receive technical assistance from SEAs to develop and implement program improvement plans. The availability and provision of technical assistance and leadership from the state to schools in Chapter 1 program improvement is key to the success of the process. Therefore, SEAs go to great lengths to offer as much technical assistance as possible and to promote program improvement as a positive process.

Program improvement institutes, Chapter 1 effectiveness conferences, and statewide Chapter 1 meetings bring state, district, and school building personnel together for training, strategy building, and dissemination of best practices. SEA staff and consultants from the state and regional offices provide workshops statewide, and in many cases, regionally.

At the beginning of the program improvement process, many SEAs conduct introductory workshops through which teams of teachers, administrators, and parents from schools recently identified for improvement are introduced to the purpose and goals of program improvement. The team concept is key to opening new dialogues and improving coordination between all staff responsible for educating children receiving Chapter 1 services. Presenting program improvement as an opportunity to implement better practice rather than as a penalty is also key.

For the early stages of program improvement, workshops often focus on identifying program weaknesses and developing a program improvement plan to correct them. Teams receive technical assistance in performing self-assessments, writing action plans, establishing timelines, and using program improvement funds. The first workshops sometimes turn the sting of identification into excitement over the potential for implementing better practice. The North Dakota State Department of Public Instruction reports that many schools were initially opposed to becoming involved in Chapter 1 program improvement, but that the majority of school districts in the state no longer view program improvement negatively.

Workshops are also geared toward the implementation phase of program improvement through staff development on effective practice and successful program improvement models. Workshops frequently include presentations from leaders of exemplary local programs and SEA curriculum and assessment specialists who link program improvement to broader school improvement themes. Additionally, SEAs help connect other providers of technical assistance to program improvement schools.

On-site visits to individual districts and schools are a key component of SEA technical assistance. Often, at the request of the school, the SEA will offer advice on targeting areas for improvement, crafting and implementing an improvement plan, and analyzing school improvement data. In Illinois, SEA staff train the staff of eighteen regional Educational Service Centers which provide on-site technical assistance to local districts in the program improvement process. While very important, the extent to which states can undertake site visits is limited by inadequate numbers of personnel and resources. In most states, SEAs work collaboratively with the TACs and Rural TACs (RTACs) to provide technical assistance. In Washington State the SEA, TAC, and RTAC have jointly trained local teams, primarily consisting of teachers, to provide individualized assistance to schools identified for program improvement.

SEAs are increasingly coordinating regular Chapter 1 monitoring and compliance requirements with program improvement in order to increase the focus on outcomes. At least one state coordinates these efforts through SEA team visits to review both program improvement and compliance issues during the self-study and planning phases of program improvement.

SEA staff are also available by telephone or correspondence to advise and assist schools and districts with responsibilities such as filling out applications for program improvement mini-grants, selecting materials, designing staff training, providing information to school boards, creating parent involvement activities, arranging staff-exchange visits, and facilitating district networks to promote joint problem-solving activities. Ongoing communication with the SEA serves a vital role in state/local collaboration and keeps schools and districts up to date on the improvement process. For this reason, most state Chapter 1 offices send program improvement guides and/or Chapter 1 newsletters to districts and schools with Chapter 1 programs. SEAs in some states also serve as libraries for audio and video in-service resources which they report are heavily used.

Coordination with the Regular Classroom and Successful Models

It is helpful to look at general issues of coordination between Chapter 1 and the regular classroom and then to look at ways they are enhanced by the program improvement process. The goals of Chapter 1, as stated in the law, are success in the regular classroom, attainment of grade-level proficiency, and improved achievement in basic and more advanced skills. Coordination between Chapter 1 and the regular classroom is critical when local programs are effectively implemented and measured on these terms. In a number of states these goals are explicitly reinforced by state policies for compensatory education.

Effective coordination across non-schoolwide project Chapter 1 programs is sometimes limited by the federal restrictions on providing services to non-Chapter 1 children, even when the Chapter 1 eligible child is the primary beneficiary of assistance. Changes to these regulations are currently being proposed by the United States Department of Education.

Under the Hawkins-Stafford Act, each school district receiving Chapter 1 assistance must be evaluated on how Chapter 1 services are coordinated with the regular program. SEAs check on coordination through local application reviews and on-site monitoring, including qualitative evaluations based on discussions with regular classroom and Chapter 1 teachers when possible. State-reported means of coordination between regular and classroom teachers include informal meetings, regularly scheduled meeting times, written communications, and joint parent-teacher conferences.

State and local education agency in-service programs support coordination between Chapter 1 and the regular classroom, as does technical assistance from the TACs and RTACs. SEAs guide the local districts on the pros and cons of various research-based models. Statewide workshops on alternative strategies are designed to encourage schools and districts to consider models other than the traditional pull-out programs. However, federal regulations restrict states from mandating the use of any particular delivery model.

Chapter 1 program improvement requirements help to initiate or expand effective coordination with the regular classroom. Program improvement provides an opportunity for Chapter 1 teachers to step back from their program and review its strengths and weaknesses with the regular classroom teachers, building administrators, and district staff. This process of review and the subsequent stages of agreeing to and implementing a program improvement plan provides a framework for uniting a school team in an effort to improve the performance of its low-achieving children. The assistance provided by the SEA through program improvement grants as well as state-level technical assistance emphasizes the collaborative team approach.

Program improvement schools are adopting a variety of learning models to coordinate and improve instruction. Though limited pull-out programs are still the most commonly used program design, a greater number of in-class approaches are being used. Coordination through more collaborative planning is emphasized for all types of service models, whether in-class, pull-out, or combined. In Kentucky's program improvement schools, substitute teachers are employed periodically to give Chapter 1 and regular classroom teachers professional time to discuss specific learning needs of jointly served children.

Improvement efforts also include shifting to schoolwide projects and revising remedial approaches into more developmentally appropriate interventions. Several states report that program improvement schools have reoriented their programs to pre-teach instead of re-teach subject matter. Through this process, children become familiar with lessons prior to introduction by the regular classroom teacher. Other models being used in program improvement schools include cooperative learning, whole language, computer-assisted instruction, literature-based reading, thematic learning, higher order thinking skills programs, after-school programs, peer coaching, more extensive parent involvement and family literacy activities, schoolwide staff development, and National Diffusion Network (NDN) programs. The state of Idaho reports fairly widespread implementation of an early intervention model that incorporates Reading Recovery training for Chapter 1 and special education and training for K-3 regular classroom teachers on early literacy. Texas reports increased pairing of gifted and talented teachers with Chapter 1 teachers on instructional strategies and joint teaching.

While a variety of models are being used in program improvement schools, there are some commonalities among successful programs. Utah, for example, identifies the following common characteristics of successful programs: involvement of administrative staff, regular education staff, Chapter 1 staff, and parents; analysis of the program in terms of student needs; regular ongoing coordination between Chapter 1 and the regular classroom teacher; focused effort; joint in-service

training for regular education and Chapter 1 personnel; and hard work and commitment.

State sponsored program improvement workshops are designed for both regular classroom and Chapter 1 teachers to develop curriculum and instruction that will best meet the needs of all students. SEA staff try to increase the classroom teachers' and administrators' awareness of their roles and responsibilities to Chapter 1 participants and the scope of Chapter 1 supplemental instruction in support of success in the regular classroom. SEA Chapter 1 staff in at least one state also address pre-service teacher classes on coordinating special services with the regular classroom.

Some states are providing specialized training in various collaborative methods of instructional delivery, such as co-teaching, team teaching, and cooperative grading and diagnosing of students. Other state-sponsored training includes programs on cooperative learning and peer tutoring for both Chapter 1 and regular classroom teachers.

Exiting Program Improvement

Based on the 1989-90 testing cycle, a significant number of schools identified for program improvement improved scores and exited program improvement before their plans were fully implemented. SEAs attribute this both to aberrations in test scores and partial development or implementation of program improvement plans.

The main factors contributing to aberrant test scores are: normal fluctuations associated with the use of NCEs as a measurement tool; inadequate numbers of students in small schools for accuracy in school-by-school measurement; and changes in school populations resulting from year-to-year transiency.

States attribute increased performance to the first stage of the program improvement process during which schools begin assessing the strengths and weaknesses of their instructional programs through the development of a program improvement plan and during which the school may pay more attention to the education of children receiving Chapter 1 services.

Despite the fact that many schools exit program improvement before their plans are fully implemented, SEAs encourage schools to continue in program improvement by offering technical assistance, program improvement workshops, and continued availability of program improvement funds. States may also specify a minimum length of program improvement status that is higher than the federal requirement. For example, the California State Department of Education mandates that a school be in program improvement for four years.

States report that some schools see benefits from following through with their improvement plans even if they have tested out of program improvement.

Joint State/Local Plans

Most states report that it is too early in the development of joint plans to assess their effectiveness. Generally, however, states report the cooperative support of local districts and participating schools in the joint planning process. A number of states report that the process of joint planning has enhanced coordination and awareness within schools, within the SEA, and between schools and the SEA.

While each state approaches the establishment of joint plans somewhat differently, collaborative leadership for improving performance is emphasized to foster a positive state/local working relationship and to support district and school ownership of the joint plan. Some states use a formal joint planning process with objective criteria or procedures to enhance low-performing programs. The degree to which the SEA takes a leadership role in establishing changes can depend on the severity of the problems at the building and district levels. Indiana and Rhode Island, for example, evaluate original program improvement plans and provide different approaches and levels of assistance depending on the quality of the original plan.

Most SEA staff work in conjunction with the TAC or RTAC to assist local districts in the development of joint program improvement plans. Assistance often begins with a workshop to go over procedures and issues. On-site assistance is designed to help teams review test data, observe classes, and help the building staff understand the strengths and weaknesses in both the school's Chapter 1 program and regular classroom services to at-risk children.

The amount of technical assistance a state can provide on site to each school in joint planning is dependent on state-level Chapter 1 resources and the number of schools that enter this stage of the improvement process. In addition to technical assistance from the SEA or its consultants, schools in joint planning typically receive a program improvement mini-grant from the state, which in some states is larger than those provided to schools in the planning and first year of implementation stages of program improvement.

Funding for Program Improvement

The Hawkins-Stafford Amendments of 1988 created tremendous responsibilities for SEAs in monitoring aggregate Chapter 1 student performance statewide and in assisting program improvement efforts in low-performing schools. In the 1991-92 school year, states were faced with addressing the needs of 11,720 schools at different stages of the program improvement process (See Appendix 2) with less than $15 million in program improvement funding and limited state administrative funds.

States document the need for substantially greater resources to provide technical assistance to schools identified for program improvement. These funds are essential for the development of effective program improvement plans, in-service training, and assistance in implementing innovative programs. As states consider further raising statewide minimum standards, they must also consider the prospects of limited resources with which to provide assistance to the increasing number of schools identified as needing help.

Of almost equal concern to SEAs are restrictions on the use of program improvement funds to respond to local requests for state technical assistance. This limitation is due to an interpretation of the law by the United States Department of Education that no program improvement funds may be used for technical assistance by SEA personnel, regional labs and centers, institutions of higher education, or any other state or local providers, unless the source is specifically approved in the local district's plan for school improvement. To comply with this requirement, most program improvement funds are used primarily for small local mini-grants, which are frequently less efficient and effective than providing technical assistance on a regional or statewide basis to schools with common needs. Proposal preparation and review requirements, coupled with the small size of grants, sometimes discourage local districts from even submitting proposals in states where LEAs must submit applications to receive funds.

Most statewide technical assistance in program improvement is supported by state administrative funds. The average state Chapter 1 office spends 35 percent of state administrative staff time on program improvement. While the appropriation for the administration of the Chapter 1 program has increased at about the same rate as total funding for Chapter 1 over the last three fiscal years, state administrative funding remains well below the level of need.

Some states have been forced to cut back on compliance monitoring and assistance to Chapter 1 programs not in program improvement, which can hurt program quality. In some cases cutbacks affect statewide assistance on alternative delivery models including assistance to schools undertaking schoolwide projects. Application approval and other important administrative functions have also been hampered.

Increasing Capacity for School Improvement

SEAs report that significant additional funds would allow them to build their capacity for school improvement assistance. *Activities that need to be expanded include:*

- SEA technical assistance devoted expressly to program improvement,
- direct assistance on site, particularly for schools in the joint state/local planning stage of program improvement,
- staff development programs for teams of local educators, including regular classroom teachers, Chapter 1 teachers, and principals, to develop greater knowledge of alternative learning and teaching models, assessment, and effective coordination between Chapter 1 and the regular classroom,
- assistance in the development of better outcome goals,
- linking of schools with common goals,
- dissemination and implementation of research-based innovative programs,
- collaboration with school improvement specialists from within and outside the SEA,
- collection, management, and use of student performance data at the state and local levels, including local electronic linkages with the SEA, and technical assistance for school district computerized data management,
- follow-up and long-term evaluation of improvement efforts,
- the hiring of additional well-qualified SEA specialists and consultants, and
- staff development for SEA Chapter 1 staff.

Additional Chapter 1 Innovation and Reform

Schoolwide projects

The schoolwide project provisions in section 1015 of Chapter 1 authorize local districts to use Chapter 1 funds to upgrade the entire educational program in schools where at least 75 percent of the children are from low-income families. Once the percentage of poor children in a Chapter 1 school reaches a high level, Congress believed it made little sense to enforce requirements that Chapter 1 serve only Chapter 1 eligible children or that Chapter 1 services be supplemental. Instead, Congress believed it was sounder educational practice to plan an instructional effort focused on the school's entire educational program. In schoolwide projects, local districts are responsible for carefully determining the resources necessary to ensure that the project is of sufficient size, scope, and quality to meet the educational needs of all children in the school, especially those who are educationally deprived.

Schoolwide projects are vehicles for comprehensive planning, organization and instructional flexibility to best meet student needs. As the Interim Report of the Chapter 1 Implementation Study notes, "Schoolwide projects have created a real sense of excitement in high-poverty schools, with principals and teachers welcoming the resources and the freedom to make changes they believe will improve their schools. In these schools, Chapter 1 is at the forefront of ideas about educational improvement." Schoolwide projects also have the advantage of removing the label "disadvantaged" from the school.

Since Congress eliminated the local match for schoolwide projects in the 1988 amendments, the number of schoolwide projects has increased substantially. From the 1989-90 school year to the 1991-92 school year the number of schoolwide projects increased by approximately 130%.[1] In the 1990-91 school year, approximately 19% of eligible schools undertook schoolwide projects.[2] While CCSSO did not collect data on the number of schools eligible for schoolwide projects in 1991-92, we can use the reported number of schoolwide projects in 1991-92 and the schoolwide eligibility data from 1990-91 to estimate that approximately 27% percent of eligible schools undertook schoolwide projects in 1991-92 (see Appendix 2).[3]

It is important to note that the number of schools eligible for schoolwide projects is greatly dependent on the low-income measure used by the local school district. The regulations require districts to use the same low-income measure for schoolwide projects as they use to identify and rank school attendance areas for basic Chapter 1 services. Where low-income eligibility is measured by the number of children qualifying for free and reduced-price lunch programs, significantly higher numbers of children are counted under the 75 percent low-income criteria than would be counted using only the number of children in the school whose families receive Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) assistance.

SEAs encourage local districts with eligible schools to take advantage of the schoolwide option by: contacting eligible schools, holding schoolwide project conferences for potential programs, encouraging districts with eligible schools to participate in the national conference on schoolwide projects, showcasing successful schoolwide projects at Chapter 1 statewide conferences, encouraging district and building staff to visit and study successful programs, and highlighting the benefits of schoolwide projects during monitoring visits.

According to the states, the amount and extent of curricular, instructional, and organizational changes that have taken place in schoolwide projects vary with the individual programs. To encourage the development and implementation of comprehensive plans, some states with schoolwide projects require one year of local planning before the schoolwide application will be approved by the SEA.

SEAs have provided technical assistance to schoolwide projects through the following types of efforts: assistance in plan development and data analysis with regional SEA staff, TACs, and RTACs; SEA written guidance; preliminary application reviews; encouragement to local districts to reduce the number of schools served by Chapter 1 so as to increase the funding for schoolwide project schools; encouragement to coordinate with state and district school improvement efforts; conferences on effective schoolwide programs; dissemina-

[1] The calculation on the percentage increase in the number of schoolwide projects is based on complete data on the number of schoolwide projects for the 1989-90 and 1991-92 school years provided by 51 SEAs.

[2] The calculation on the percentage of eligible schools which undertook schoolwide projects in the 1990-91 school year is based on complete data provided by 51 SEAs on the number of operating and eligible schoolwide projects in the 1990-91 school year.

[3] The estimate on the percentage of schools which undertook schoolwide projects in the 1991-92 school year is based on complete data provided by 51 SEAs on the number of schools operating schoolwide projects in 1991-92 and the number of schools that were eligible for schoolwide projects in 1990-91.

tion of information on successful projects; provision of technical assistance on request; monitoring of performance; site visits during implementation; and on-site staff development.

States report the use of schoolwide projects for the following activities and purposes:

- reduction in class size,
- implementation of comprehensive alternative delivery models,
- greater use of computer-assisted instruction,
- use of in-class teaching assistants,
- coordination of educational services for all students,
- establishment of teacher resource centers,
- ongoing and more inclusive staff development,
- team teaching,
- cross-age grouping,
- cooperative learning,
- revamping of the total curriculum or broadening of instructional models,
- purchase of supplementary reading and math materials,
- parent programs to bridge the gap between home and school,
- on-site and cooperative planning with family service agencies,
- early childhood programs,
- all day kindergarten and school-based day care centers for students,
- expanded opportunities for field trips,
- extended-day and extended-year programs,
- implementation of National Diffusion Network projects,
- better use of the school library, and
- implementation of Effective Schools research.

Schools with schoolwide projects must comply with annual program improvement requirements for all Chapter 1 schools. These schools must also show that Chapter 1 eligible students have as a whole achieved minimum levels of improved performance after three years in order for the school to continue using funds schoolwide. By establishing three-year plans, schools are given an opportunity to plan for significant, long-term change. The program improvement requirements gear planning and implementation to improved outcomes rather than just improved inputs. Chapter 1 coordinators estimate, however, that a significant number of schools may fail to meet the schoolwide project performance requirements after three years due to the following factors: changes in tests between baseline years and subsequent years, the very high concentration of disadvantaged students in schoolwide project schools, high student mobility, and the transition periods which occur when implementing new programs.

Schoolwide project maintenance of effort provisions in the 1988 law were designed to ensure that the federal funding for schoolwide projects does not replace state and local funding for participating schools. For each fiscal year during which a schoolwide project is conducted, the amount of local and state funds expended per child must be at least equal to what the school district expended per child in that school in the preceding fiscal year. A district must be able to demonstrate that Chapter 1 funds are being used in each schoolwide project to increase the level of funds that would have been made available from non-federal sources, in the absence of Chapter 1 funds, for educating the school's students.

As many states and localities face budget cuts, they are encountering problems with the 100% maintenance of effort requirement. First, the requirement jeopardizes continued funding of some excellent existing schoolwide projects due to a decline in state or local revenue, which is outside the control of the school. Second, the rule acts as a disincentive for schools to undertake schoolwide projects for fear that after extensive planning and transition to schoolwide use of funds the school may be disqualified and forced to revert back to its previous mode of delivery. Third, the rule is inconsistent with the regular Chapter 1 maintenance of effort requirement at the district level, which allows for a 10 percent variance in expenditure of state and local funds from year to year. As of mid-July 1992, Congress was considering legislation to change the schoolwide project maintenance of effort requirement to allow a reduction in fiscal effort within the school commensurate with the average reduction in expenditures for all schools in the district.

CCSSO asked states to provide data or best estimates of the number of schools that would be eligible for schoolwide projects if the low-income eligibility threshold were reduced from the current minimum of 75 percent to 60 percent, 50 percent, and 40 percent. Lowering the eligibility threshold addresses issues fundamental to Chapter 1, includ-

ing whether Chapter 1 is supporting high quality services in most existing schoolwide projects, and whether children eligible for Chapter 1 services in schools with high levels of poverty below 75 percent might receive better services through schoolwide use of funds. CCSSO has not yet taken a position on lowering the threshold.

Based on the estimates of the forty-seven states that provided complete information on current and estimated schoolwide project eligibility, we can estimate that lowering the threshold to 60 percent would lead to a 71 percent increase in the number of schoolwide projects, lowering the threshold to 50 percent would lead to a 152 percent increase and lowering the threshold to 40 percent would lead to a 239 percent increase.

Statewide Coordination

Most states are implementing a statewide school improvement program and Chapter 1 is being coordinated with these statewide efforts and with national education goals in a variety of ways. A number of state education agencies, including the Indiana Department of Education, have published math proficiencies or curriculum frameworks based on the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics standards. Indiana reports that these proficiencies are widely reflected in the program improvement plans related to math curriculum and instructional strategies for Chapter 1 math programs. In California, Chapter 1 has promoted statewide improvement efforts and the program improvement concept has been incorporated into state legislation under consideration, which would put all low-performing schools in the same school improvement process. In Kansas, Chapter 1 program improvement will be integrated into the State's Quality Accreditation Performance (QPA) process, a new system of accrediting schools based on student outcomes. State education agencies have also supported initiatives that are complementary to program improvement. In Vermont, for example, the SEA has helped form and financially support a collaborative in Reading Recovery.

When Chapter 1 programs and personnel are linked to broader school improvement efforts, the impact of Chapter 1 can be enhanced. This conclusion is supported by the Interim Report of the Chapter 1 Implementation Study; it states, "A factor that appeared to facilitate the planning process for schools in need of improvement was the existence of a district or state improvement initiative that also required school-based planning."

A number of states are coordinating the use of federal dollars to leverage the maximum educational impact. In Pennsylvania, for example, Chapter 1 is integrated with Chapter 2 and the Eisenhower program (Title II), and all program improvement efforts involve all three federal programs. The same SEA staff members who work with the school districts are responsible for Chapter 1, Chapter 2 and the Eisenhower program, and all three programs are monitored collaboratively.

In other states, Chapter 1 and Chapter 2 are coordinated through combined workshops on school improvement and the use of Effective Schools money for districts with schools in Chapter 1 program improvement or for training SEA staff. In addition, states report local coordination of Chapter 1 and Chapter 2, which in some cases results from encouragement by the SEA.

Nineteen states report that they operate state compensatory programs similar to Chapter 1. In most states, Chapter 1 and the state compensatory education program are very closely aligned and, often run by the same staff at the state and local levels. In Michigan, the state compensatory education program is administered and monitored by the same SEA staff in conjunction with Chapter 1. In California it is difficult to make a distinction at the school level between Chapter 1 and the state compensatory education program. It should be noted that the high level of congruence makes it difficult for the state to report data on services provided through Chapter 1 as disaggregated from the state compensatory education program. In states where the federal and state compensatory education programs are in different divisions, communication between the divisions helps to coordinate services.

With regard to both school improvement and compensatory education, there are efforts across the states to coordinate programs better through consolidated monitoring, applications and operation. A number of states with school improvement programs allow schools to submit their district or school improvement plans without submitting a special plan for Chapter 1. A number of states have moved from a one-year to three-year application cycle to reduce local administrative requirements. States are also working to eliminate unnecessary data collection and avoid duplication with other programs or data collection requirements. Many states are in the process of computerizing their information systems; some are completely

automating their Chapter 1 reporting so that school districts will be able to submit reports electronically.

While states are prohibited by law from mandating the expenditure of Chapter 1 funds for early childhood education (including both preschool and the early elementary years), most states actively encourage such use of funds by emphasizing its benefits in workshops, pre-application reviews, literature, on-site visits, and other contacts with local districts. Successful early intervention models are emphasized at state and regional in-service conferences sponsored by SEAs. Nationally, there has been a slight increase in the number of children served in Chapter 1 preschool programs. More significantly, in the average state reporting grade level data, over 50 percent of Chapter 1 services are provided to young children in preschool through grade 3 programs. In Maryland, where the SEA has encouraged the development of preschool and early primary years programs for more than twelve years, 81 percent of Chapter 1 services are provided to students in grade 3 or lower.

The coordination of Chapter 1 with early childhood services plays an important role in maintaining effective and continuous services for at-risk students. Early childhood linkages between Chapter 1 preschool and Head Start (as well linkages between Head Start and early elementary programs) are difficult because Head Start, the largest early childhood program for disadvantaged four-year-olds, is a direct federal-to-local program. As a result, there is no state agency counterpart with which SEAs can coordinate funding for Head Start and Chapter 1 statewide. A number of state Chapter 1 offices report increasing discussions in this area, partly as a result of the Head Start Transition Project, which has provided local grants in over 30 states to help bridge Head Start and education services. In West Virginia, the SEA encourages schools that operate both Chapter 1 schoolwide projects and Head Start programs to include Head Start in the schoolwide project plans.

In 1992, Even Start, the family literacy program targeted to at-risk children ages 0-7 and their families, became an SEA-based program. This program is providing an important family-centered linkage for literacy services at the preschool, early elementary school and adult levels. As the implementation of Even Start proceeds, SEAs expect increasing coordination between Chapter 1, Head Start and other preschool programs.

SEAs report formal and informal dialogue between Chapter 1 staff and early childhood program directors at the state level. These interactions provide a basis for building connections between education and early intervention services. In Illinois the State Board of Education has entered into an interagency agreement with Head Start to collaborate in planning and implementing preschool programs. SEA programs that are affected include the state-funded pre-K program for children at risk of academic failure, the special education program for three- to five-year- olds, and Chapter 1 preschool. A number of SEAs have formal linkages with early childhood education through participation on state task forces or other such coordinating bodies focused on early childhood intervention. In Louisiana, for example, Chapter 1 staff have joined with representatives of Head Start, child advocacy groups, and universities in an Early Childhood Study Commission charged with ensuring that children come to school ready to learn.

Chapter 1 Services to Limited English Proficient (LEP) Children

Local districts are required by Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 to provide special educational services to limited English proficient (LEP) children. Chapter 1 funds are prohibited by federal regulation from being used to provide services related to overcoming students' language development needs. However, if LEP children have needs stemming from educational deprivation and not solely from their lack of proficiency in English, the children must be identified as eligible for Chapter 1 and selected for services on the same basis as other Chapter 1 children. The local district must coordinate the Chapter 1 services with the services required by law.

Determining the appropriateness of Chapter 1 services for LEP children is a complex issue because it is virtually impossible to determine whether an LEP student is failing to make progress for reasons other than a language deficit. When appropriate testing is not available in the child's native language, staff have to make the Chapter 1 placement decision based on the best available information and their professional judgement.

State education agencies have disseminated guidance consistent with federal guidelines to local districts on Chapter 1 services to LEP children. Additional guidance is provided in some states. In Ohio, for example, there are three levels of services for students with limited English proficiency. When students reach the third level, they are identified as no longer having difficulties solely as a result of a language barrier.

States report ongoing communication between SEA bilingual and Chapter 1 staff to address the needs of LEP children who qualify for Chapter 1 services and to assist local districts in this area. Coordination includes Chapter 1 workshops on eligibility and appropriate services led by SEA bilingual staff. Some states also provide on-site assistance or assist in finding experts in the field who can provide technical assistance to districts. Wisconsin, which has a mandated bilingual education program, has promoted coordination of services through joint planning between program consultants and joint monitoring visits to districts with bilingual, Chapter 1 basic and Chapter 1 migrant programs.

Chapter 1 Services to Children Receiving Special Education

Children receiving services to overcome a handicapping condition may also be eligible to receive Chapter 1 services if they have needs stemming from educational deprivation not solely related to the handicapping condition. Such children are selected on the same basis as other children selected to receive Chapter 1 services. Chapter 1 funds may not be used to provide the special education and related services that are required by federal, state, or local law. However, local districts must provide maximum coordination between Chapter 1 services and services provided to address children's handicapping conditions.

State guidance on Chapter 1 services to children receiving special education services is provided through means similar to guidance on LEP services including information dissemination to local districts, presentations at workshops, and in some cases dissemination of alternative delivery modes. A number of states also report state-level coordination among SEA special education and Chapter 1 staff.

As many states and localities work to mainstream special populations by encouraging services in the regular classroom, the relationship between Chapter 1 and special education is receiving increasing attention, as is the importance of providing in-service training for teachers on children with special needs. A few states report increasing numbers of children in Chapter 1 who previously received special education services. A shift in services from special education to Chapter 1 will make schools accountable for the educational performance of these children under the Chapter 1 accountability requirements for the individual and the school. Such a shift may result in increased identification of schools for program improvement.

Broader Coordination Themes Between Categorical Programs

On issues of broader coordination between Chapter 1, special education, LEP services, and migrant education, some states have: written policy statements on coordination of services, undertaken demonstration projects, or provided guidance to local districts to encourage cooperative planning and implementation of separate programs that serve the same children or children with similar needs. States seek additional federal leadership in this area.

In Minnesota, the SEA in conjunction with the TAC is working with twelve pilot sites in urban and rural areas to develop models that other sites can duplicate for coordinating services such as Chapter 1, migrant education, English-as-a-second-language, and special education.

For nearly ten years, local districts in the state of Washington have been attempting to coordinate categorical programs. Many districts have designed blended models, which provide instruction to children based on similar needs and staff expertise. The SEA, in conjunction with the districts, has developed documents to assist LEAs interested in blending. The SEA, districts and the State Auditor's Office have created a time-and-effort document to help districts learn how to legally co-mingle funds from different programs.

A number of these comprehensive efforts to coordinate categorical programs are part of broader school improvement efforts. In North Carolina, for example, State Department of Education staff are working through the Comprehensive Schools Project to coordinate all resources within individual schools so as to improve their entire school program.

Professional development also plays an important role in the coordination of services funded by categorical programs. In Massachusetts, for example, statewide professional development programs for teachers and administrators focus on issues pertaining to the integration of instruction. In addition, the state's Lucretia Crocker Fellows program, in which exemplary teachers are selected by the state to work with districts that want to replicate successful models, has annually included integration models in either Chapter 1, special education, or bilingual education.

* * *

Across the states, Chapter 1 program improvement has put a framework in place to raise expectations and improve the education of our nation's at-risk children. Implementation has led to increased accountability for educational outcomes at the school, district, and state levels; a school-based state and local partnership for change; and an increased state technical assistance role in school improvement. Additionally, the provisions of the Hawkins-Stafford Act, which facilitated the establishment of schoolwide projects, have enabled schools with very high concentrations of poverty to use Chapter 1 funds more efficiently and in many cases support significant change schoolwide. Finally, Chapter 1 accountability provisions are providing important areas of linkage to existing and emerging school improvement efforts in the states.

We hope the state profiles which follow provide a comprehensive picture of the efforts across the states to implement the 1988 amendments to Chapter 1.

References

Federal Register. "Chapter 1 Program in Local Educational Agencies; Final Regulations." Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, May 19, 1989.

Federal Register. "Chapter 1 Program in Local Educational Agencies; Notice of Proposed Rulemaking," Washington D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, May 26, 1992.

Jennings, John. "Chapter 1: A View From Congress." *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis.* Washington D.C: American Educational Research Association, Vol. 13 no. 4, 1991, pp. 335-338.

Millsap, Mary Ann et al. *The Chapter 1 Implementation Study Interim Report.* Cambridge, MA: Abt Associates, Inc. under contract with the U.S. Department of Education Office of Policy and Planning, 1992.

National Center for Education Statistics. "American Education at a Glance." Washington D.C.: U.S. Department of Education, 1992.

U.S. Congress. "Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services and Education and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1989." Public Law 100-436. Washington D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1988.

U.S. Congress. "Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services and Education and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1990." Public Law 101-166. Washington D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1989.

U.S. Congress. "Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services and Education and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1991." Public Law 101-517. Washington D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1990.

U.S. Congress. "Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services and Education and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1992."

Public Law 102-170. Washington D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1991.

U.S. Department of Education. Office of Elementary and Secondary Education. *Chapter 1 Policy Manual.* Washington D.C.: U.S. Department of Education, 1990.

APPENDIX 1

CHAPTER 1 PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT DATA BOX

State	Number of Schools in Prog. Improvement	Percent of Ch. 1 Schools in Prog. Improvement	Number of Schools in Joint Planning	Percent of State Ch. 1 Staff Time Used for Prog. Improvement
ALABAMA	334	36%	13	50%
ALASKA	31	15	8	15
ARIZONA	166	30	28	35
ARKANSAS	405	45	106	40
CALIFORNIA	356	5	289	50
COLORADO	216	35	12	35
CONNECTICUT	61	10	1	35
DELAWARE	64	58	3	30
D.C.	64	24	0	—
FLORIDA	356	35	0	30
GEORGIA	254	25	12	65
HAWAII	56	64	26	40
IDAHO	100	25	11	25
ILLINOIS	1,045	45	17	60
INDIANA	326	29	35	75
IOWA	93	9	0	25
KANSAS	128	18	4	20
KENTUCKY	271	26	12	20
LOUISIANA	310	37	38	55
MAINE	165	30	6	31
MARYLAND	283	70	63	85
MASSACHUSETS	172	17	6	15
MICHIGAN	705	34	101	25
MINNESOTA	164	17	1	25
MISSISSIPI	482	60	287	20
MISSOURI	253	50	0	60
MONTANA	29	5	3	25
NEBRASKA	180	32	3	40
NEVADA	18	5	2	15
NEW HAMPSHIRE	64	21	1	6
NEW JERSEY	206	10	8	25
NEW MEXICO	116	26	8	15
NEW YORK	302	10	6	30
N. CAROLINA	465	35	25	40
N. DAKOTA	25	8	0	75
OHIO	264	11	1	10
OKLAHOMA	93	8	3	15
OREGON	27	3	1	20
PENNSYLVANIA	627	28	28	60
PUERTO RICO	184	13	0	75
RHODE ISLAND	73	47	3	50
S. CAROLINA	121	22	37	40
S. DAKOTA	66	15	2	10
TENNESSEE	453	27	101	35
TEXAS	616	10	66	15
UTAH	51	19	6	30
VERMONT	64	21	7	30
VIRGINIA	189	22	15	25
WASHINGTON	106	11	3	17
W. VIRGINIA	151	27	47	30
WISCONSIN	350	25	21	45
WYOMING	20	17	5	20
TOTALS	11,720		1,481	
AVERAGE PCT.		26%		35%

Source: CCSSO Survey of State Coordinators of Compensatory Education, February 1992.

Note: Data on the number of schools in program improvement include schools in all stages of program improvement.

Dash indicates data not provided.

APPENDIX 2

SCHOOLWIDE PROJECT DATA BOX

State	No. of SWP's 1989-90	No. of SWP's 1990-91	No. of SWP's 1991-92	No. Schools Eligible for SWP's 1990-91	Percent of Eligible Schools Operating SWP's 1990-91	Estimated No. of Schools That Would be Eligible for SWP's at the Following Low-Income Eligibility Thresholds:		
						60%	50%	40%
ALABAMA	42	67	66	198	34%	332	464	671
ALASKA	4	6	9	111	5	136	156	168
ARIZONA	20	36	36	150	24	250	350	400
ARKANSAS	10	34	42	88	39	184	320	496
CALIFORNIA	161	66	71	905	7	1,500	2,300	3,000
COLORADO	1	2	2	8	25	46	84	170
CONNECTICUT	0	0	0	8	0	24	44	61
DELAWARE	0	0	0	0	0	—	—	—
D.C.	0	12	16	56	21	71	85	90
FLORIDA	85	113	133	180	63	269	371	509
GEORGIA	3	28	37	110	25	243	408	579
HAWAII	0	0	0	0	—	1	1	2
IDAHO	2	3	3	8	38	9	23	100
ILLINOIS	12	13	25	159	8	479	620	700
INDIANA	4	6	7	33	18	92	150	239
IOWA	1	1	1	5	20	20	69	156
KANSAS	2	5	8	22	23	100	199	409
KENTUCKY	14	35	80	145	24	285	410	565
LOUISIANA	12	12	15	204	6	464	684	786
MAINE	0	0	0	2	0	—	—	—
MARYLAND	31	33	30	52	63	102	138	202
MASSACHUSETTS	26	42	80	120	35	300	400	500
MICHIGAN	2	36	71	150	24	250	330	400
MINNESOTA	2	2	11	5	40	79	167	286
MISSISSIPPI	32	84	139	300	28	472	607	700
MISSOURI	3	5	10	39	13	100	150	300
MONTANA	1	0	0	35	0	58	103	157
NEBRASKA	0	0	0	4	0	29	57	108
NEVADA	0	0	0	4	0	12	17	31
NEW HAMPSHIRE	0	0	0	2	0	—	—	—
NEW JERSEY	4	8	16	66	12	128	176	235
NEW MEXICO	9	25	39	130	19	257	350	442
NEW YORK	7	51	121	—	—	625	731	840
N. CAROLINA	16	37	66	112	33	160	450	700
N. DAKOTA	1	1	1	8	13	14	28	68
OHIO	14	36	60	226	16	488	696	986
OKLAHOMA	6	6	7	58	10	217	402	637
OREGON	8	10	11	15	67	80	122	250
PENNSYLVANIA	62	92	112	103	89	223	500	600
PUERTO RICO	0	0	9	1375	0	1,375	1,375	1,375
RHODE ISLAND	0	1	3	3	33	24	31	39
S. CAROLINA	1	7	34	192	4	307	404	547
S. DAKOTA	5	12	12	30	40	31	69	150
TENNESSEE	98	118	134	124	95	546	718	—
TEXAS	76	164	247	630	26	950	1,500	1,900
UTAH	1	4	12	8	50	24	41	66
VERMONT	0	0	0	3	0	12	21	31
VIRGINIA	—	9	13	9	100	19	33	53
WASHINGTON	3	3	3	43	7	125	229	405
W.VIRGINIA	3	15	23	54	28	210	382	544
WISCONSIN	9	15	20	34	44	48	111	190
WYOMING	0	0	0	5	0	5	10	25
TOTALS	793	1,255	1,835	6,331		11,775	17,086	21,868
AVERAGE PCT.					25%			

Source: CCSSO Survey of State Coordinators of Compensatory Education, February 1992

Note: SWP = Schoolwide Project. Dash indicates data not provided. Overview trend analysis adjusts for missing data

Alabama

Chapter 1 Participation and Funding Summary

Participation Levels in School Year (SY)1990-91

Number of Children Served:	129,131
Percentage of K-12 Students Served:	18%
Number and Percentage of School Districts Receiving Chapter 1 Assistance:	128; 99%
Number and Percentage of Schools Receiving Chapter 1 Assistance:	921; 65%

Chapter 1 Services by Grade Span in SY 1990-91

Preschool	<1%
Kindergarten	5%
Grades 1-3	45%
Grades 4-6	37%
Grades 7-12	12%

State Funding Levels by School Year

Formula Grants Allocation SY 1990-91, 1991-92:	$103,648,970; $121,559,125
Formula Grants Allocation SY 1992-93:	$133,725,057
Chapter 1 Per Pupil Expenditure SY 1990-91:	$808
Program Improvement Allocation SY 1991-92, 1992-93:	$289,865; $483,709

Chapter 1 Program Improvement Summary

Number of Schools in Program Improvement in SY 1991-92

Total Number of Schools in Program Improvement:	334
Percentage of Chapter 1 Schools in Program Improvement:	36%
Number of Schools in Joint Planning:	13

Statewide Minimum Standards for Improvement—Demonstration of gains greater than zero normal curve equivalents (NCEs) in aggregate performance in grades 2-12 and achievement of 75 percent of each desired outcome required for pre-kindergarten, kindergarten, 1st grade, and for services to limited-English-proficient children who are receiving Chapter 1 services.

Chapter 1 Program Improvement

Leveraging Accountability and Higher Performance

Chapter 1 program improvement has helped Alabama's school districts focus attention on the lowest performing children who are at the greatest risk of educational failure. The process has engaged staff at the school, district, and state levels in a coordinated effort to increase Chapter 1 student performance in the regular classroom.

With regard to standards, the state education agency (SEA) encourages coordinated use of NCEs in conjunction with other desired outcomes. The Committee of Practitioners and the SEA have considered raising the threshold to 80 percent in determining if substantial progress has been made in achieving the other desired outcomes.

None of the schools identified for program improvement in the 1989-90 and 1990-91 school years were exempted based on local conditions.

Statewide Technical Assistance

While local education agencies (LEAs) have the responsibility for establishing realistic and measurable outcomes, the SEA is encouraging and helping schools establish locally determined desired outcomes in addition to NCE gains on norm-referenced tests. SEA technical assistance provided to schools includes assisting LEAs with writing reasonable and realistic desired outcomes that can be measured. Evaluation workshops have been scheduled with each LEA to focus on development of these outcomes.

The SEA Chapter 1 staff (usually the consultant assigned to the LEA) will provide assistance, as requested by the LEA central office staff, to identified schools. That assistance may include, but is not limited to, the following activities: facilitation for the local school to secure needed assistance from staff members of the SEA, Technical Assistance Center (TAC), Rural Technical Assistance Center (RTAC), universities, and other appropriate sources; presentation of curriculum and instructional strategy workshops and program improvement workshops designed to guide LEAs in the program improvement process; and help securing program improvement funds.

The SEA provides local and statewide workshops on the development of advanced skills. Successful school models are discussed and demonstrated at workshops and in-service meetings.

In order to reduce the negative reaction at the local level accompanying the identification of schools for improvement, the SEA has held workshops that inform local coordinators and principals about the improvement plan, new federal requirements, and available services. Schools that have

demonstrated successful improvement plans are invited to speak and share successful ideas and strategies. SEA consultants meet with superintendents, principals, and school staff to guide them in developing and implementing successful program improvement plans.

Successful Models

There are many models for curriculum, instructional strategies, and coordination with the regular program in the program improvement schools. The SEA, after visiting many schools identified for improvement, believes that the secret to making significant changes in schools includes goal setting, collaboration, enthusiasm, determination, and positive thinking. Grade-level meetings have been held in schools to plan strategies for progress. Teachers have worked with SEA consultants to develop criterion-referenced tests to monitor students' progress.

Exiting Program Improvement

Three hundred nineteen schools in Alabama (35% of all schools receiving Chapter 1 assistance) were identified for program improvement on the basis of 1989-1990 data. Of these schools, 246 (77%) tested out after one year before fully implementing their program improvement plans. Identification of schools for program improvement forces the LEA and school staff to look at strengths and weaknesses within the instructional program. The development and implementation of their program improvement plans enables a majority of schools to test out.

The SEA, through program improvement workshops and technical assistance, encourages schools that exit program improvement before fully implementing their plans to continue in the program improvement process, even though these schools are not required to do so.

Joint SEA/LEA Plans

The following means are used by the Alabama Department of Education to develop joint plans with LEAs that have schools identified for program improvement activities. The SEA has employed a Program Improvement Coordinator who, along with the Chapter 1 staff consultant assigned to a particular school system have the primary responsibility for assisting the LEA in the development and implementation of a joint program improvement plan. Joint improvement plans have fostered increased collaboration primarily between SEA Chapter 1 staff, the school improvement office staff, and reading and mathematics curriculum specialists. This collaboration includes joint presentations at conferences and workshops, planning of state-sponsored in-service workshops, and visits to individual LEAs. Thus far, the results of the joint plans have been positive. Chapter 1 has become a program better tailored to individual schools and more concerned with student outcomes.

Chapter 1 has become a program better tailored to individual schools and more concerned with student outcomes.

Funding for Program Improvement

All of the 1990-91 program improvement funds have been distributed to date. Schools identified for program improvement for the first time may use these additional funds in the development of their program improvement plans. Schools that have completed improvement plans may use these funds for materials and supplies, in-service, or other items to support implementation of the plan. In order for a school to obtain additional program improvement funds, the LEA must apply for these funds. Almost all of the program improvement funds are provided to LEAs through mini-grants.

The state currently devotes approximately half of its Chapter 1 administrative time to program improvement responsibilities. All of the state technical assistance in program improvement is supported by state administrative funds.

State Education Department consultants visit schools and assist in developing and implementing improvement plans. There have been no Chapter 1 administrative activity cutbacks as the result of increased attention devoted to program improvement. Program improvement activities are ongoing and coordinated with every aspect of Chapter 1.

The SEA is making a strenuous effort to coordinate Chapter 1 monitoring and compliance requirements with Chapter 1 program improvement goals. The SEA is required to monitor and give technical assistance to LEAs developing and implementing joint plans. The SEA remains in a positive, collaborative position and strives to improve Chapter 1 services and performance while helping to identify resources to be used by its LEA in implementing their plans.

Increasing Capacity for School Improvement

There is a need for more technical assistance in the area of program improvement to LEAs throughout the state. Effective data management is critical at all levels. More staff development workshops in the areas of outcome goals, testing, and data management are needed. Additional funds could be used to assist schools and districts in developing and implementing program improvement plans.

Additional Chapter 1 Innovation and Reform

Schoolwide Projects

Number of schoolwide projects in Alabama by school year:

1989-90	42
1990-91	67
1991-92	66

There were 198 Chapter 1 schools in Alabama eligible for schoolwide projects during the 1990-91 school year. Approximately 34 percent of these schools undertook schoolwide projects during the 1990-91 school year.

The SEA has provided schoolwide project information to all LEAs within the state. SEA staff members have held numerous workshops, at LEA request, which have focused on schoolwide project requirements. LEAs have been encouraged to share information about their schoolwide projects with other LEAs at various state conferences. Many have responded during the past three years.

Curricular, instructional, and organizational changes that have been undertaken in schools through schoolwide projects include: (1) upgrading of teacher and school effectiveness through schoolwide intensive, systematic, and comprehensive in-service training; (2) the addition of computers and computer programs that focus on basic and advanced reading and math skills instruction; (3) additional paraprofessionals to provide tutoring services to students and to assist teachers; (4) additional certified personnel to reduce teacher/student ratios; (5) additional personnel to provide support services in the areas of health, guidance, and parental involvement; (6) extended day programs; (7) an additional teacher to serve in a resource capacity to assist other personnel in the teaching of reading and math; (8) the adoption of additional supplementary reading and math materials to reinforce basic program instruction and to assist personnel in better individualizing instruction; (9) and implementation of the "Success for All" model of instruction.

Decreases in state funds for FY 92 have affected LEAs' abilities to meet maintenance of effort requirements for schoolwide projects. Six schools that had begun implementation were forced to discontinue. Several other schools that had planned to begin implementation in FY 92 were prohibited for fiscal reasons.

Sixty percent of the schools that are currently in the second or third year of schoolwide project implementation have been identified for program improvement activities as required by Chapter 1 regulations. Therefore, these schools may have difficulty meeting the third year accountability requirement.

The SEA makes the following estimates of the number of schools that would be eligible for schoolwide projects if the low-income eligibility threshold were reduced from 75 percent to the following levels: 332 schools at 60 percent, 464 schools at 50 percent, 671 schools at 40 percent.

Coordination with the Regular Classroom

Communication between the Chapter 1 teacher and the classroom teacher is of major importance. Regularly scheduled meeting times, informal conversations, written communication forms, and joint parent-teacher conferences are ways that classroom teachers and Chapter 1 instructional staff are encouraged to effectively share information about instruction for Chapter 1 students.

Workshops are scheduled that encourage LEAs to provide Chapter 1 services in the regular classroom and coordinate services with regular classroom teachers. Program improvement workshops and local technical assistance cause schools to examine their existing programs. This often leads to a comprehensive needs assessment process, which is then followed by a restructuring process. The implementation of program improvement plans has produced positive effects in many schools. These effects are most noticeable in Chapter 1, but their impact often extends throughout the school.

Chapter 1 mandates extensive parental involvement. Workshops are scheduled in LEAs to help parents understand that one of the goals of Chapter 1 services is to help their children succeed in the regular school program. As a result of training Chapter 1 and regular classroom teachers in coordinating home-school communication, Chapter 1 teachers can interact with regular classroom teachers to reinforce efforts with Chapter 1 children.

Statewide Coordination

The Chapter 1 program improvement efforts have fostered increased collaboration between state education staff from a number of different areas. SEA efforts to foster collaboration include work with assessment and evaluation of the Migrant Program; work with the Early Childhood Program in developing a skills checklist to identify educationally deprived children; and work with the Student-Assessment section in identification of students not making substantial progress.

The state has provided guidance about ways to coordinate Chapter 1, state compensatory, special education, and bilingual funds through individual technical assistance. In addition, the state has five Even Start programs, three pre-school programs, and Migrant programs funded by Chapter 1.

Before limited-English-proficient (LEP) students enter Chapter 1 programs, LEAs must determine that the LEP students are educationally disadvantaged and can benefit from Chapter 1 program participation. Lack of English language proficiency alone is not used as the basis for serving LEP students in Chapter 1.

In order to select LEP students for Chapter 1, LEAs are required to supplement their "core" Chapter 1 student selection procedures with additional measures to determine LEP students attainment in basic and more advanced skills. Additional measures to determine educational depriva-

tion include norm- or criterion-referenced tests and basic skills checklists designed to assess basic skills competence in English and other languages, language proficiency tests, teacher rating scales, classroom grades, classroom test results, and home language surveys. Chapter 1 and bilingual/English-as-a-second language (ESL) staff members have developed program directions for LEAs to use in appropriately selecting LEP students to receive Chapter 1 services. Workshops sponsored by the Chapter 1 staff frequently focus on providing LEAs with appropriate information.

The SEA sent out a letter to all LEAs concerning the coordination of Chapter 1 with special education. The federal regulations and guidelines were clearly spelled out. Chapter 1 statewide workshops have addressed the subject and state education consultants have given individual technical assistance to LEAs concerning this matter.

Making a Difference School by School

Schoolwide Project at Woodcock Elementary, Mobile

Woodcock Elementary School in Mobile is in its first year of schoolwide project implementation. Woodcock serves 491 students in grades K-5. Ninety-eight percent of students qualify for free or reduced meals. Stanford Achievement Test results from the 1989-90 school year indicated that the average national percentile and stanine score for the school in total reading were 17 and 3, respectively.

The approved schoolwide project plan for Woodcock includes the following activities, which are all being implemented as stated:

Kindergarten: The Baratta-Lorton Reading Program will be implemented. The elements of this program are reading readiness skills, oral language development, and station work. This program allows children to progress according to their individual development. Kindergarten teachers will be trained to implement the program.

Grade 1: The Baratta-Lorton Reading Program will be implemented during the second year of the three-year project (1992-1993).

Grades 1-5: Five Chapter 1 teachers who previously have taught only Chapter 1 students will now be reassigned to the regular program to teach students in each of these grade levels. The reassignment of teachers will reduce class size at these grade levels to an average pupil-teacher ratio of 21:1. Additional reading instructional supplies, such as ancillary materials for the basal reading program, will be purchased.

Grades K-5: A master teacher will be assigned as the Parent Specialist/Helping Teacher to work on a professional basis to increase parental and community involvement, make home visits, assist teachers with demonstrating teaching, coordinate the in-service programs for the faculty, conduct parenting workshops, and serve as coordinator for the Chapter 1 schoolwide project. This person will be under the direct supervision of the principal.

One aide will be employed to work with the parent specialist and the counselor to assist in parenting workshops and in coordinating attendance procedures related to student motivation and ongoing programs for students identified as "at risk."

Four instructional aides will be employed for grades K-3. They will assist the teachers at these grade levels with reading instruction by working with students on an individual basis and in small groups. The aides will work under the direct supervision and direction of the principal.

The Chapter 1 computer and the computers presently in the media center will be consolidated so that a complete class of students can be served. Two full-time aides will staff the computer lab. Software will be purchased to supplement the basal and co-basal reading programs. Students in kindergarten and 1st grade will go to the lab once a week for 30 minutes to work with the regular classroom teacher and the aide on specific reading skills. Students in grades 2-5 will go to the lab with the aide and regular classroom teacher twice a week for reading instruction. Students in grades 4 and 5 will be given special instruction on word-processing skills.

Additional library books and audiovisual materials will be purchased for each grade level. Special emphasis will be given to materials that supplement the reading program in the school. These materials will be available for check-out to all students in the school and their parents. Guidance materials will be purchased for the Guidance Counselor and Parent Specialist to use with all students.

Chapter 1 nursing services will be increased from one day to five days a week through the employment of a full-time aide for the First Aid Room. This person will be responsible for working with students and parents in matters of health education, personal hygiene, dental health, eye and ear care, maturation, and physical development.

Professional in-service will be provided as follows: All teachers and paraprofessionals will participate in a half-day meeting of educators from all schools involved in the Chapter 1 Schoolwide Project. Kindergarten and 1st grade teachers will attend two days of training in implementing the Baratta-Lorton Reading Program. All teachers will receive a half day of training in computer instruction, participate in two days of training for the Talents Unlimited Program, and attend in-service sessions on (1) classroom management and Effective Schools research and (2) effective reading instruction strategies. Teachers in grades 1 through 5 will participate in a half-day training session related to the use of the SRA Lab.

Alaska

Chapter 1 Participation and Funding Summary

Participation Levels in School Year (SY) 1990-91

Number of Children Served:	5828
Percentage of K-12 Children Served:	5%
Number and Percentage of School Districts Receiving Chapter 1 Assistance:	52; 97%
Number and Percentage of Schools Receiving Chapter 1 Assistance:	199; 42%

Chapter 1 Services by Grade Span in SY 1990-91

Preschool	3%
Kindergarten	6%
Grades 1-3	47%
Grades 4-6	34%
Grades 7-12	10%

State Funding Levels by School Year

Formula Grants Allocation SY 1990-91, 1991-92:	$7,781,671; $9,039,056
Formula Grants Allocation SY 1992-93:	$10,844,300
Chapter 1 Per Pupil Expenditure SY 1990-91:	$1,348
Program Improvement Allocation SY 1991-92, 1992-93:	$90,000; $180,000

Chapter 1 Program Improvement Summary

Number of Schools in Program Improvement in SY 1991-92

Total Number of Schools in Program Improvement:	31
Percentage of Chapter 1 Schools in Program Improvement:	15%
Number of Schools in Joint Planning:	8

Statewide Minimum Standards for Improvement—An increase in aggregate normal curve equivalent (NCE) scores and substantial progress toward meeting other desired outcomes.

Chapter 1 Program Improvement

Leveraging Accountability and Higher Performance

The message that districts and schools will be publicly accountable for federal funds has had a profound effect on Chapter 1 programs in Alaska. Evaluation reports cannot be "shelved" upon completion and the status quo maintained. The role of the state education agency (SEA) has been strengthened in a positive way. Overall compliance has improved. The majority of district and school personnel have reacted favorably to program improvement, welcoming the opportunity and assistance for change.

The Committee of Practitioners (COP) has expressed a commitment to encouraging higher standards. The number of additional schools identified by an across-the-board higher NCE standard would, however, severely impact the limited resources available for technical assistance, which is very expensive in a state of such vast distances. The COP will be considering other desired outcomes that would provide appropriate but realistic expectations for improvement in schools that may already be struggling to achieve overall performance above thirty NCEs.

District applications are approved on the basis of appropriate expectations of performance. The annual statewide conference includes discussion of desired outcomes and methods of assessment. The Chapter 1 Technical Assistance Center (TAC) and Rural Technical Assistance Center (RTAC) have also disseminated information statewide that supports the notion of higher local expectations. Interest in alternative assessments, such as portfolios and locally-developed skills-based criteria, has increased.

Statewide Technical Assistance

The SEA relies heavily on the RTAC to meet the technical assistance needs of schools in program improvement, in particular the development of a program improvement plan. Districts and schools are contacted by the SEA to individually assess their need for planning assistance. Materials that encourage team-building and support a self-assessment and planning process are distributed to all schools. Four-member teams consisting of parent, teacher, Chapter 1 staff member, and principal attend a three-day workshop that culminates in a draft plan. On-site visits by SEA and RTAC staff take place as needed.

Program improvement training and materials include research on best practices and exemplary program models that incorporate these methods. The self-assessment materials direct participants to examine the extent to which these practices are evidenced in their current program. The RTAC is currently developing a "Sourcebook" of successful Chapter 1 projects in Alaska for statewide distribution. Planning is also

ALASKA

under way for a series of in-service training programs to be delivered statewide via audio-conference network.

The SEA contacts the local education agency (LEA) coordinator by telephone to confirm the identification of schools targeted for program improvement. A personal call is also made to the superintendent, followed by a letter of notification. Information about the requirements, technical assistance, and program improvement funding is enclosed. Pre-workshop information packets are sent to principals who prepare the team for the planning process. Periodic follow-up calls and correspondence help to maintain a personal, individualized support network for school staff.

Successful Models

Program improvement plans in Alaska have included schoolwide projects, centralized computer system programs, and adoption of whole-language and cooperative learning approaches. Significant changes have been made in the way districts allocate Chapter 1 funds and how well services are targeted. Several schools have revised their approaches from remedial to developmental, focusing on preschool and early grade services. Most school staff have recognized a need for training the Chapter 1 aide and for more meaningful parent involvement.

In several instances, the Chapter 1 improvement process has facilitated local efforts for school improvement. Some schools being identified for Chapter 1 improvement are candidates for comprehensive school improvement planning supported by more frequent assistance and greater resources than Chapter 1 can provide.

Exiting Program Improvement

Forty percent of the schools identified in FY90 tested out in FY91. It should be noted that the improvement occurred for the interim planning year, that is before the plans were implemented. These schools were encouraged by the SEA, however, to continue implementation as planned, including the use of technical assistance resources and program improvement funding.

Joint SEA/LEA Plans

The joint planning process in Alaska is primarily a continuation of the initial process. Technical assistance is continued or increased as needed, with frequent monitoring contacts by the SEA and TAC or RTAC. The SEA is fostering in-house coordination for the lower-achieving districts and schools in the state. Joint plans were recently developed and will be implemented in the 1992-93 school year.

Funding for Program Improvement

Carryover funds and RTAC resources have been used to provide technical assistance services during SY 1991-92. Districts have recently submitted requests for program improvement funds that will support implementation activities of the thirty-one identified schools. Minigrants up to $2500 per school will be issued for use in the spring and next year.

Approximately 1.0 full-time equivalent (FTE) of state administrative staff time is devoted to program improvement: .75 FTE for a program specialist, and the remaining .25 split between data technician and program administrator time. This represents approximately 15 percent of state administrative/staff time. Time spent on monitoring for compliance has been reduced, from a three-year to a five-year cycle. Compliance reviews are conducted by the same person who is assigned to provide technical assistance to the district. On-site reviews also provide an opportunity for monitoring how well plans are being implemented. Typical plans incorporate goals that improve compliance as well as the quality of instruction.

Increasing Capacity for School Improvement

SEA resources devoted to school restructuring, school improvement, or district strategic planning are limited outside of the Chapter 1 improvement process. Additional resources would allow the SEA to augment program improvement and school restructuring efforts. There is also a need to increase both the SEA and LEA capacity for interpreting and using evaluation data for improvement.

The message that districts and schools will be publicly accountable for federal funds has had a profound effect on Chapter 1 programs in Alaska.

Additional Chapter 1 Innovation and Reform

Schoolwide Projects

Number of schoolwide projects in Alaska by school year:

1989-90:	4
1990-91:	6
1991-92:	9

Twenty-four percent (111 schools) of the 474 schools in the state meet the 75 percent low-income criteria; however, that percentage includes schools that have not been selected for Chapter 1 services.

The annual program conference, the program improvement workshop, and the program newsletter each promote awareness of the schoolwide project as a delivery option. Technical help to schoolwide projects has centered primarily on meeting the evaluation requirements. The SEA estimates that two schoolwide projects may have difficulty meeting the three-year performance requirement.

If revenues decline as projected, maintenance of effort could pose some difficulty in the future. The SEA makes the following projections of the number or schools in the state that would be eligible for schoolwide projects if the low-

income eligibility thresholds were reduced from 75 percent to the following levels: 136 schools at 60 percent, 156 schools at 50 percent, and 168 schools at 40 percent.

Coordination with the Regular Classroom

The annual program conference included sessions devoted to sharing building-level strategies for coordination with the regular program and with other special services. The SEA staff has worked cooperatively with bilingual, special education, and curriculum staff to promote integrated instructional services.

Statewide Coordination

Current SEA efforts in school improvement are limited due to lack of resources. Districts are required to submit an annual report card to be used in establishing improvement goals. The Chapter 1 program improvement process attempts to accommodate these goals.

The SEA has coordinated the Chapter 1 and Migrant Education application, evaluation, and monitoring forms in an attempt to ease the burden on local staff. The SEA also established a data collection/forms committee charged with reducing the duplication and complexity of information-gathering activities.

The SEA has two early childhood education specialists with whom a Chapter 1 representative meets regularly to discuss issues related to parent involvement, curriculum and assessment, and coordination of preschool programs, including Head Start, with kindergarten and/or Chapter 1 programs. For the past two years, this SEA team has actively promoted the use of Chapter 1 funds for preschool and early grade services by presenting at various state conferences, regular mailouts, and a Primary Network newsletter. The SEA staff coordinate in-house with curriculum and early childhood programs to offer in-service training opportunities for both regular teachers and Chapter 1/Migrant aides.

The SEA recommends that limited-English-proficient (LEP) and handicapped children be selected for Chapter 1 on the basis of the need for basic skills instruction that is not directly related to those conditions, and that Chapter 1 services supplement the bilingual and special education services. The SEA has established a task force on multicultural education that includes representatives from bilingual, special education, regular curriculum, and Chapter 1/Migrant Education programs. Issues related to over-identification and duplicated services are discussed.

Making a Difference School by School

Schoolwide Project at Government Hill Elementary, Anchorage

Government Hill Elementary is completing a three-year schoolwide project focused on improving language arts and math performance. A combination of home-based computers, integrated curriculum, and increased parent involvement were used. Results thus far indicate "turnaround," with positive gains for both language arts and math.

Arizona

Chapter 1 Participation and Funding Summary

Participation Levels in School Year (SY) 1990-91

Number of Children Served:	79,364
Percentage of K-12 Children Served:	12%
Number and Percentage of School Districts Receiving Chapter 1 Assistance:	210; 96%
Number and Percentage of Schools Receiving Chapter 1 Assistance:	547; 54%

Chapter 1 Services by Grade Span in SY 1990-91

Preschool	1%
Kindergarten	7%
Grades 1-3	34%
Grades 4-6	30%
Grades 7-12	28%

State Funding Levels by School Year

Formula Grants Allocation SY 1990-91, 1991-92:	$52,616,311; $58,873,468
Formula Grants Allocation SY 1992-93:	$62,392,791
Chapter 1 Per Pupil Expenditure SY 1990-91:	$648
Program Improvement Allocation SY 1991-92; 1992-93:	$156,142; $248,984

Chapter 1 Program Improvement Summary

Number of Schools in Program Improvement in SY 1991-92

Total Number of Schools in Program Improvement:	166
Percentage of Chapter 1 Schools in Program Improvement:	30%
Number of Schools in Joint Planning:	28

Statewide Minimum Standards for Improvement–One normal curve equivalent (NCE) gain in both basic and advanced skills and substantial progress in achieving locally determined desired outcomes. At least one desired outcome must be based on the Arizona Student Assessment Plan. Beginning with the 1993 school year, all Chapter 1 participants must be evaluated based on the prescribed district assessment plan, the results of which will then be validated by the state testing program.

Chapter 1 Program Improvement

Leveraging Accountability and Higher Performance

The Arizona State Department of Education strongly supports program improvement because Chapter 1 can serve as a catalyst for systemic change in those schools where the vast majority of children have been identified as being eligible for Chapter 1. The combination of significant funding, the opportunity to institute schoolwide projects, and the program improvement provisions cause principals to institute the restructuring process.

By increasing standards, reliability on desired outcomes for identifying schools, and state assistance, the state education agency (SEA) is addressing the problem of some low-performing schools avoiding program improvement because they are making the minimum NCE gain.

Statewide Technical Assistance

Through workshops, conferences, memoranda, and personal visits, the SEA has strongly encouraged the use of assessment data to evaluate desired outcomes. The State Board has mandated that all children will master prescribed skills, and a state performance-based test in grades 3, 8, and 12 is used to validate the local education agency (LEA) assessment. Beginning with the 1993 school year, all Chapter 1 participants must be evaluated based on the prescribed district assessment plan, the results of which will then be validated by the state testing program. At least one desired outcome must be based on the Arizona Student Assessment Plan.

The SEA views norm-referenced tests as unrepresentative of the program and inconsistent with the State Board's Essential Skills. The Committee of Practitioners (COP) has decided against raising aggregate achievement objectives and has discouraged raising the statewide standard in terms of NCE gains on norm-referenced tests. Members argue that norm-referenced testing is not consistent with the goals of Chapter 1 and the state testing program. However, the COP is realistic about the need for higher standards and has emphasized the development of desired outcomes. The COP is currently drafting a policy regarding standards for desired outcomes.

The technical assistance that the SEA is providing to the schools identified for improvement include workshops, consultants, materials, and individual counseling. Program improvement schools are prioritized for assistance. An SEA program specialist is assigned to each school to monitor and assist the school team as needed. A se-

ries of school improvement workshops is conducted for the school teams. Topics include, but are not limited to: methods of conducting an effective needs assessment, research on effective schools and instruction, evaluation designs, and developing action plans. During the first year of the school improvement plan, participation in the series of workshops is at the discretion of the LEA and building administration.

A complete review of the instructional model is made by the specialist assigned to the school to ensure that the selected model is appropriate to the population being served. This process includes review of appropriate advanced skills for the students, and is aligned with the total instructional focus of the school.

On-site workshops are conducted by the SEA specialist assigned to the school or an outside resource person. These workshops are designed to be specific to individual school improvement plans. A cadre of Arizona educators is being organized to act as a resource to program improvement schools. Members of this cadre will be available to mentor, consult in specialty areas, and perform as an external review team.

To reduce any potential negative association at the local level accompanying identification of schools for program improvement or the initiation of joint plans, LEAs are requested to work with principals to identify schools having "programs that can be made more effective." At meetings with superintendents, principals, and staff members, program improvement schools are presented as implementing exemplary practices. SEA staff strive to present program improvement in a positive tone.

Successful Models

To increase program emphasis on the development of advanced skills and the adoption of successful models, emphasis in program monitoring has been changed to reflect greater focus on the development and operation of effective programs. The state conference is focused on improving the quality of programs and emphasizes exemplary practices. The conference, which is attended by principals, Chapter 1 directors, and teachers, was devoted to program improvement issues. The keynote speaker, Dr. Lorin Anderson, presented a guide to decision making for improvement of Chapter 1 programs. All workshops were based on the conceptual framework of school/program restructuring as outlined by Dr. Anderson.

Though schools have primarily operated pull-out programs, a greater number of replacement models, indirect services (for example, in-service training), and schoolwide projects are being planned. The SEA finds increasing emphasis also on coordination of services and integration of instruction.

Exiting Program Improvement

Eight of the schools (10 percent) identified for program improvement based on the 1989-90 testing cycle tested out of program improvement before their plans were fully implemented. Most of these tested out because they faithfully instituted the program improvement plan. The State Program Improvement Plan stipulates that once identified for program improvement, schools are in program improvement for at least the year of implementation.

Joint SEA/LEA Plans

The SEA approach to working with schools in joint plans results from the experiences with joint planning schools over the past two years. The degree to which the SEA takes a leadership role in establishing changes depends on the severity of problems at the building and LEA level. A plan has been drafted that allows for timely SEA intervention yet provides for appropriate due process.

Some schools have developed comprehensive, research-based plans. These schools only require more time for implementation and nominal oversight. However, three schools, each having over 95 percent of enrollment eligible for Chapter 1, have not been able to meet timelines and have not demonstrated any increase in achievement. An SEA specialist provides as much technical assistance to these schools as limited resources permit. All technical assistance is supported with funds assigned to the SEA through its state administration grant and program improvement funds. In addition, program improvement mini-grants are also available to schools from the SEA. The state plan is being revised to allow for greater SEA intervention in such situations by increasing resources and SEA oversight.

Funding for Program Improvement

All 1990-91 program improvement funds have been distributed to date. Approximately 70 percent of the program improvement money is being used for mini-grants to LEAs rather than direct SEA technical assistance. Approximately 35 percent of Chapter 1 state administration staff time is devoted to responsibilities for program improvement. All state technical assistance in program improvement was supported by state administrative funds last year.

As a result of increased attention devoted to program improvement, the number of monitorings has been decreased and approval of applications and amendments has been delayed. To coordinate Chapter 1 monitoring and compliance requirements with Chapter 1 program improvement goals, the SEA has become increasingly reliant on external audits to verify compliance with regulatory requirements in non-program improvement LEAs. LEAs with schools in program improvement are prioritized for compliance monitoring. In addition, workshops on Chapter 1 program models and successful practices are conducted for these schools.

Increasing Capacity for School Improvement

The SEA Chapter 1 office is working with the state assessment and curriculum unit to align goals and objectives. However, the SEA cannot continue these efforts and meet both compliance and program

improvement responsibilities without additional support. The SEA has become increasingly reliant on audits for compliance and there has been an increase in the number of audit findings, some requiring fiscal sanctions.

Previously, the technical assistance provided by the SEA through monitoring enabled districts to address areas of noncompliance in a timely manner. More regularly, LEAs are voluntarily reporting audit exceptions previously corrected in monitoring. The SEA has tried to become more efficient in its operation. The process for submitting and approving grants is being automated, and workshops are transmitted by satellite, thereby reducing travel. However, the addition of program improvement, the awarding of mini-grants, and the accountability for the funds have substantially increased the SEA's responsibilities. Significant additional staff time is required to use Chapter 1 funds in the most effective way.

Additional Chapter 1 Innovation and Reform

Schoolwide Projects

Number of schoolwide projects in Arizona by school year:

1989-90	20
1990-91	36
1991-92	36

Approximately 150 schools in Arizona were eligible for Chapter 1 schoolwide projects in the 1990-91 school year.

LEAs are often advised that schoolwide projects involve a restructuring of the school's instructional program and organization. To encourage the development and implementation of schoolwide projects, the SEA showcases such projects at the state conference. The SEA encourages eligible schools to coordinate program improvement efforts with schoolwide project plans. The SEA consultant meets individually with school teams that express an interest in schoolwide projects.

Most schools entering schoolwide projects have undergone major restructuring. The schoolwide project plan acts as an umbrella plan under which all instructional, curricular, and organizational changes are coordinated.

A planning period of one year is required for approving schoolwide projects. Exceptions to this requirement will be made on a case-by-case basis for schools that can demonstrate that a commitment to change has been made and planning has been comprehensively undertaken.

A cadre of Arizona educators is being organized to act as a resource to program improvement schools. Members of this cadre will be available to mentor, consult in specialty areas, and perform as an external review team.

The SEA estimates that the following number of schools would be eligible for schoolwide projects if the low-income eligibility threshold were lowered from 75 percent to the following levels: 250 schools at 60 percent, 350 schools at 50 percent, and 400 schools at 40 percent.

Coordination with the Regular Classroom

To encourage LEAs to provide Chapter 1 services in the regular classroom and coordinate services with the regular classroom teacher, the SEA has widely disseminated the goals of Chapter 1, which are: success in the regular program of study, attainment of grade level proficiency, and mastering of basic and advanced skills.

The SEA has also emphasized coordination through monitoring by requiring that an objective based on each child's success in the regular program be used as an evaluation measure. The SEA Chapter 1 office is coordinating efforts with the SEA's Assessment Unit to provide in-service to teachers and administrators on evaluating a Chapter 1 participant's success in the regular program of study. The Chapter 1 office has offered statewide training to improve the quality of classroom instruction to both Chapter 1 and classroom teachers. A series of workshops on effective programs, curriculum, teaching, school culture, and community has been well attended. These efforts have led to increased awareness by regular classroom teachers and administrators of their roles and responsibilities to Chapter 1 participants.

Statewide Coordination

Arizona has begun to coordinate Chapter 1 with its state assessment system. Beginning in the 1993 school year, all programs must have at least one desired outcome per goal that evaluates the child's mastery of the State Board of Education's listing of Essential Skills. This evaluation must be consistent with the Arizona Student Assessment Plan.

The SEA has reduced the number of required reports and streamlined the application process to reduce paperwork at the local level. For example, applications are approved for a three-year period. Year one typically requires an eleven-page document. A three-page renewal application is submitted in years two and three. Additionally, beginning in FY 93, all forms will be made available on diskette. Finally, installation of the Chapter 1 automated reporting system will be completed in 1993, following the testing period. LEAs will then be able to submit all reports and forms electronically.

The number of Chapter 1 preschool and early intervention programs has increased. In the 1991 school year, 43 percent of Chapter 1 services were focused

on preschool to grade 3 programs. While the SEA has advocated prevention rather than remediation, the decision as to where to earmark services is left to the LEA. Districts study the demographics and educational needs of each Chapter 1 eligible student at the building level prior to determining program priorities.

The coordination of Chapter 1, Head Start, and other early childhood programs at the state level has progressed slowly. The State Chapter 1 Director is a member of the Children's Action Alliance's Early Childhood Education Subcommittee. Initially, the Committee has focused on information sharing. Greater coordination occurs at the local level. LEAs are able to organize resources available in their areas.

The SEA Chapter 1 office, in cooperation with special education and bilingual education, has prepared a policy on the coordination of services. This policy restates the position that Chapter 1 funds are to be used to serve the educational needs of eligible students. No group of children is to be disallowed from services. Rather, selection is determined on a case-by-case basis, as it is for all Chapter 1 eligible students. Special Education and Chapter 1 have agreed that Chapter 1 funds cannot be used to address needs stemming from a handicapping condition. Staff considers the best interest of the child along with legal requirements. In addition to disseminating this policy to all LEAs, the directors of special education, bilingual education, and Chapter 1 have jointly presented workshops at state and regional conferences.

Limited-English-proficient (LEP) children must be selected for Chapter 1 services in a manner comparable to English-speaking children. The program must be appropriate for students' needs. Selection must be based on a screening in the child's native language and the evaluation must be accomplished consistently with regulatory requirements and program objectives. A child is not considered educationally disadvantaged because of limited English proficiency.

Chapter 1 and special education staff meet annually to review policies and study practices in Arizona. The SEA also believes that schools must take into account the best interest of the child. Consequently, if a special education child can best be served through the Chapter 1 teacher, then a proportionate amount of Chapter 1 teacher time must be charged to special education.

Making a Difference School by School

Schoolwide Project at Alfred E. Garcia Elementary School, Phoenix

The Effective Schools research is evident in Garcia's project through the development of a schoolwide mission statement; the development of schoolwide goals related to instruction and budget; and an integrated, participatory management approach.

Site-based management, team-building, and communication with all individuals at the school are a part of the decision-making process. The school is organized into teams that meet on a regular basis to discuss, plan, and evaluate all aspects of the programs at Garcia.

Positive school climate is important at Garcia and is fostered through a comprehensive student/staff recognition program, an attendance program, a comprehensive substance-abuse program, cross-grade tutoring, and team teaching.

The schoolwide goals addressed through program design at Garcia consist of: all-day kindergarten for all children, access to computer labs for all K-8 students, Chapter 1 resource teachers who work individually and in small groups with selected students in greatest need extensive in-service training for staff Higher Order Thinking Skills (HOTS) classes for all students in grades 4-6, family literacy training for all teachers, and implementation of programs for families.

Program Improvement at Lawrence Elementary School, Tucson

The school improvement goals for Lawrence Elementary over three years were to improve the basic and advanced reading, writing, and math skills of all students; to identify a variety of authentic and performance-based assessment instruments for more reliable assessment of student performance; and to promote a positive school climate.

Key elements of the program improvement activities include staff development in areas of learning/teaching styles, English-as-a-second language (ESL) and Sheltered English, team-teaching concepts, and gender equity/student achievement. Additional priorities include increasing parental participation in classroom instruction, reducing student suspensions, and increasing methods of recognizing and acknowledging student achievements.

Arkansas

Chapter 1 Participation and Funding Summary

Participation Levels in School Year (SY) 1990-91

Number of Children Served:	72,050
Percentage of K-12 Children Served:	17%
Number and Percentage of School Districts Receiving Chapter 1 Assistance:	324; 100%
Number and Percentage of Schools Receiving Chapter 1 Assistance:	907; 83%

Chapter 1 Services by Grade Span in SY 1990-91

Preschool	<1%
Kindergarten	8%
Grades 1-3	38%
Grades 4-6	34%
Grades 7-12	19%

State Funding Levels by School Year

Formula Grants Allocation SY 1990-91, 1991-92:	$57,643,608; $67,386,728
Formula Grants Allocation SY 1992-93:	$74,191,849
Chapter 1 Per Pupil Expenditure SY 1990-91:	$580
Program Improvement Allocation SY 1991-92; 1992-93:	$169,396; $280,637

Chapter 1 Program Improvement Summary

Number of Schools in Program Improvement in SY 1991-92

Total Number of Schools in Program Improvement:	405
Percentage of Chapter 1 Schools in Program Improvement:	45%
Number of Schools in Joint Planning:	106

Statewide Minimum Standards for Improvement–1.87 normal curve equivalent (NCE) gains in basic and advanced skills.

Chapter 1 Program Improvement

Leveraging Accountability and Higher Performance

The Arkansas Department of Education believes that program improvement provides the incentive and financial means necessary for schools to examine and improve current Chapter 1 programs and implement successful new ones.

The state has raised the minimum standard in aggregate achievement each year. The Committee of Practitioners (COP) has encouraged the higher statewide standards in terms of NCE gains on norm-referenced standardized tests. However, if NCE gains are to be considered the triggering mechanism for program improvement, then local education agencies (LEAs) do not have an incentive to establish other desired outcomes.

Statewide Technical Assistance

The Arkansas state education agency (SEA) has divided the state into six regions with a program advisor for each region. Each is responsible for schools in that region in the areas of project approval, monitoring, technical assistance, and program improvement. A technical assistance visit is made to each school during the first year of program improvement. When a school is involved in joint planning, the program advisor meets with each school committee and provides guidance on the type of program that will be implemented during the coming year.

Program advisors are also given training on successful programs, and play an important role in facilitating attendance of LEA staff at worthwhile in-service sessions. The SEA also sponsors a mid-winter conference for LEAs and other special sessions. During area meetings in April of each year, the SEA informs local administrators of new initiatives or changes in Chapter 1. Other technical assistance providers include the Technical Assistance Center (TAC) staff, who plan a number of workshops, and the National Diffusion Network (NDN) Facilitator. During all contacts with LEAs, the SEA emphasizes that program improvement is a positive process for improving instruction.

The program improvement application is designed so that LEAs must give an objective for basic skills and also a separate objective for advanced skills. Failure to make substantial progress toward meeting the objective in either triggers program improvement.

Successful Models

Successful models undertaken in program improvement schools include the Effective Schools Program, the Comer Model, and the Higher Order Thinking Skills (HOTS) Program.

Joint SEA/LEA Plans

After a school is identified for program improvement, the SEA project advisor meets with the LEA's Chapter 1 program improvement committee to disaggregate data and discuss weaknesses and strengths of the school's Chapter 1 program. The advisor and committee then jointly agree upon a course of action for improving the school program, a plan is then written for approval.

Funding for Program Improvement

All of the program improvement money is being used for mini-grants to LEAs.

Approximately 40 percent of state Chapter 1 administration staff time is devoted to responsibilities for program improvement. This represents 100 percent of the statewide technical assistance provided by the SEA for program improvement.

Increasing Capacity for School Improvement

The time that program advisors are able to spend with schools in program improvement is very limited. Additional funds are critical to allow the SEA to hire staff with expertise in program improvement.

Program monitoring has been reduced by at least 30 percent since program improvement has been in effect. The complete process is geared toward achievement and accountability.

Additional Chapter 1 Innovation and Reform

Schoolwide Projects

Number of schoolwide projects in Arkansas by school year:

1989-90:	10
1990-91:	34
1991-92:	42

Arkansas had eighty-eight schools eligible for Chapter 1 schoolwide projects in the 1990-91 school year.

To encourage eligible schools to undertake schoolwide projects, the SEA has held workshops on schoolwide projects, recommended attendance at other workshops sponsored by the U.S. Department of Education, and given individual technical assistance upon request.

Chapter 2 is offering special workshops on Effective Schools practices for which Chapter 1 staff give coordinated assistance.

Successful models undertaken in schoolwide projects are similar to those undertaken in program improvement schools and include Effective Schools practices, HOTS, and the Comer model.

The Arkansas Department of Education makes the following estimates of the number of schools that would be eligible for schoolwide projects if the low-income eligibility threshold were reduced from 75 percent to the following levels: 184 schools at 60 percent, 320 schools at 50 percent, and 496 schools at 40 percent.

Coordination with the Regular Classroom

The program advisors encourage LEAs to look at models that offer better coordination with the regular program. The mid-winter conference focuses on effective methods and the NDN showcases effective programs in areas around the state.

If NCE gains are to be considered the triggering mechanism for program improvement, then LEAs do not have an incentive to establish other desired outcomes.

Statewide Coordination

The SEA has a statewide system for program improvement and is working to eliminate duplicate and unnecessary reporting. During in-service training, the SEA staff interact and learn more about the activities of other programs. Chapter 1 and Chapter 2 also hold common workshops dealing with student progress. The number of Chapter 1 early childhood programs has increased, as have state early childhood programs.

Making a Difference School by School

Program Improvement at C.D. Franks Elementary School, Ashdown

During the planning phase of program improvement, staff from C.D. Franks Elementary School developed a reading improvement strategy that included the goals of changing program design, increasing staff development opportunities, and boosting parental involvement.

To implement the plan, the district added aides and instructional assistants for in-class tutoring, and after-school and summer school programs. In the classroom, the instructional assistants work with small groups of students to reinforce, practice, or preview reading assignments.

The district also hired a consultant to train school staff in the subject of learning designs. A parent center and a parent coordinator were added to the school to help parents become more involved in the activities of their children. The TAC also conducted a workshop on parental involvement.

Five members of the Chapter 1 staff who received a School Improvement Grant from the Arkansas Department of Education were able to attend the National Reading Styles Institute in Atlanta, Georgia, over the summer. Since then, the staff members have been incorporating new insights in reading research into the teaching-learning process in their classrooms. A leading trainer of teachers has also helped teachers to incorporate more tactile-kinesthetic materials into their teaching methods to help those students who learn better through hands-on experience.

Teachers are implementing other new techniques — such as recorded books to improve reading skills — to better suit their students' learning styles and strengths. The underlying notion is that every student has an individual learning style depending on whether their strengths are visual, auditory, or tactual. In the reading program, the Chapter 1 staff incorporate three keys to success: increase motivation, decrease stress, and teach children through their strengths and preferred reading styles. Feedback from parents and other teachers helps Chapter 1 staff evaluate the success of the techniques.

California

Chapter 1 Participation and Funding Summary

Participation Levels in School Year (SY) 1990-91

Number of Children Served:	1,122,786
Percentage of K-12 Children Served:	25%
Number and Percentage of School Districts Receiving Chapter 1 Assistance:	986; 97%
Number and Percentage of Schools Receiving Chapter 1 Assistance:	6,535; 89%

State Funding Levels by School Year

Formula Grants Allocation SY 1990-91, 1991-92:	$463,174,140; $475,311,709
Formula Grants Allocation SY 1992-93:	$541,365,329
Chapter 1 Per Pupil Expenditure SY 1990-91:	$412
Program Improvement Allocation SY 1991-92; 1992-93:	$1,443,230; $2,321,406

Chapter 1 Program Improvement Summary

Number of Schools in Program Improvement in SY 1991-92

Total Number of Schools in Program Improvement:	356
Percentage of Chapter 1 Schools in Program Improvement:	5%
Number of Schools in Joint Planning:	289

Statewide Minimum Standards for Improvement–A normal curve equivalent (NCE) gain greater than zero in basic and advanced skills and substantial progress in achieving locally determined desired outcomes including at least one outcome from a list of options provided by the state.

Chapter 1 Program Improvement

Leveraging Accountability and Higher Performance

Program improvement has provided leverage for promoting change in the schools identified. It gives the school necessary assistance from local education agencies (LEAs) and the state education agency (SEA) to analyze all data relevant to Chapter 1 students and to develop a school site plan. The SEA directs the schools to focus their attention on curriculum, instruction, and assessment, as well as staff development, parent involvement, and school climate in an attempt to understand how these activities support success in the regular educational program for all students.

Because of program improvement, there is more direct contact with schools by local school districts and the SEA. Technical assistance is being provided to some for the first time. Services are delivered to schools at the district, region, and individual levels from SEA staff. Many of the ideas on planning and implementing program improvement are included in state restructuring efforts.

Prior to 1991-92, California used the California Assessment Program (CAP) for the desired outcome. The test is being redeveloped. In the interim, the Committee of Practitioners (COP), mandated through the State Plan Addendum, that program improvement schools select a desired outcome from a provided laundry list (i.e., attendance; graduation rates; portfolios; the California Learning Record, which is patterned after the British Learning Record; and writing samples). Department staff has provided statewide technical assistance on writing effective desired outcomes.

The SEA and the COP are discussing raising the minimum standard, which has not been raised since 1989. The COP, however, is reluctant to spend time deciding the value of raising the standards of NCEs while the state concurrently seeks better measures than NCEs.

The annual progress data that are submitted to the Department has taken on new meaning because it is now being used to determine when a school can exit program improvement. While the use of norm-referenced tests (NRTs) is restrictive and does not necessarily test what is being taught, the importance of evaluating the services that compensatory education students receive in the regular and supplemental programs has been elevated.

Statewide Technical Assistance

To encourage LEAs to develop more realistic desired outcomes, the SEA has orchestrated a number of collaborative technical assistance activities with the two Technical Assistance Centers (TACs), SEA staff, and local agencies. In December of 1991, these groups conducted a Statewide Teleconference which highlighted the topics of alternative assessment, schoolwide projects, and innovative activities that have proven successful. The SEA has also held a number of awareness workshops at major conferences during the year and will make setting desired outcomes a part of LEA training in preparation for developing the 1992-93 application for funding. The SEA will also make more program improvement school training available in the plan development stage.

The type of technical assistance provided by the SEA includes a "Leadership Seminar" to update schools on the latest innovative practices and to organize them for regional assistance. During the year, the SEA meets with the schools regionally, based on their needs. The "Achieving Schools Conference" serves as a culminating activity for all schools. To combat the negative view of program improvement, the SEA keeps all of its contacts positive.

No monitoring or compliance activities have been curtailed because of program improvement. The Chapter 1 program improvement goals are a part of the state monitoring process.

Successful Models

With regard to models for curriculum, instructional strategies, and coordination with the regular program, models presently operating in the program improvement schools include family reading for parents, staff, and students; the "Reading to Write" program; the mock trial program for history/social studies; a homework hotline; family math; after-school tutorial programs; parent centers; a newsletter for parents; the early reading intervention Reading Recovery; and the California Learning Record. Many LEAs are also setting aside funds for ongoing staff development; hiring special consultant staff to work with program improvement schools; and using cooperative learning, technology in the classroom, and thematic teaching.

Exiting Program Improvement

The California State Plan mandates that a school be in program improvement for four years (three years after the plan is submitted). Fifty-one schools (approximately 15 percent) were released from program improvement status due to mistaken identification (the schools were performing well, but checked the wrong box on the Consolidated Application used to identify program improvement schools) or because of increased performance or district re-evaluation. When the SEA is notified in writing that the district made an error, an analysis of three years of data is done. If there is consistent progress over the time period, the LEA is released from program improvement activities. However, when the data are not consistent, the SEA strongly recommends that the school stay in program improvement. The final decision rests with the district.

Joint SEA/LEA Plans

Currently, there are 289 schools with joint plans in California. In 1992-93, the SEA expects to add 67 newly identified program improvement schools to the joint plans. Immediately after identification, the SEA staff works very closely with schools to develop and implement a joint plan.

Funding for Program Improvement

All of the program improvement funds have been allocated without a problem for California.

Approximately 82 percent of the program improvement money is being used for mini-grants to LEAs. The remaining 18 percent is set aside for direct SEA technical assistance. Approximately 50 percent of Chapter 1 state administration staff time is devoted to responsibilities for program improvement.

Increasing Capacity for School Improvement

There are a number of schools that could benefit from having funds to hire a full-time person to work at the school site to guarantee that change is taking place. There are entities in California capable of providing this intensive service, but funding is necessary. The current resources are not enough to provide this kind of assistance to the most needy schools. At the state level, additional funds are needed for data collection, statewide initiatives, and coordination of services.

Additional Chapter 1 Innovation and Reform

Schoolwide Projects

Number of schoolwide projects in California by school year:

1989-90	161
1990-91	66
1991-92	71

In 1990-91, approximately 905 schools were eligible for schoolwide projects according to selection criteria using AFDC or free and reduced lunch. One of the reasons for the low number submitting for schoolwide projects is the inability of schools to meet the 100 percent fiscal accountability requirement for state and local funds. This is a nationwide issue because of the economic situation and the resulting major cuts in spending for education. The total reliance on NRTs to judge progress is also a barrier to more schools taking advantage of this flexibility. The solutions are to allow a percentage "leeway" for maintenance of state and local funds (as is available in the regular Chapter 1 Maintenance of Effort provision) and to allow multiple measures for progress that more realistically display students' outcomes.

The SEA contacts districts with potentially eligible schools to encourage them to develop schoolwide projects. In the spring of 1992, the SEA held a statewide meeting for existing and potential schoolwide projects to focus on strategies of organizing a project and to provide an opportunity to hear first-hand from existing schools making significant progress toward meeting the accountability measures selected in their three-year plans. Consultants in the Compensatory Education Office provide ongoing technical assistance to the schoolwide project schools.

The following curriculum, instructional, and organizational changes are occurring in schoolwide projects: more coordination of services for all students;

ongoing staff development for all staff; a greater emphasis on parent programs that bridge the gap between the home and school; more frequent implementation of cooperative learning; revamping and improvement of the total curriculum; organization of early intervention programs; and, in a few schools, restructuring to include on-site comprehensive health, social service, and early childhood services.

In addition to the criteria required in the regulations, the SEA requires schoolwide projects to: select accountability measures prior to submitting the plan to the SEA, approve a plan that appears to be developed for quality, promote annual improvement, insist on evidence of innovation, and report progress toward meeting accountability measures to the LEAs annually.

After reviewing two years of NRT data for schoolwide projects in their third year of implementation, it appears that approximately 50 percent of the schools will meet one of the accountability measures available. The third-year data will be used to make a final determination on continuing this delivery system.

The SEA provides a good deal of technical assistance to schoolwide projects in all phases of implementation. Anecdotal information shows that the following have made a tremendous impact on the students and the staff: relieving the schools of the need to alert students of the label of "disadvantaged", making support available for restructuring of the total program, emphasizing staff development, coordinating services for students and their parents at the school, and combining resources to meet the needs of all students.

The SEA makes the following estimates of the number of schools that would be eligible for schoolwide projects if the low-income eligibility threshold were reduced from 75 percent to the following levels: 1500 schools at 60 percent, 2300 schools at 50 percent, and 3000 schools at 40 percent.

Coordination with the Regular Classroom

The California State Department of Education is promoting the in-class model with the resource (special) teacher working cooperatively with the classroom teacher. There are a number of summer academies that promote this practice, and the SEA features this activity using practitioners from the classroom in all of the conferences and training provided during the year .

Statewide Coordination

Chapter 1 has promoted statewide improvement efforts for restructuring. The ideas used in program improvement have been a part of state legislation that is in the process of being approved. The state-sponsored school improvement program has been in existence for a number of years and is coordinated with Chapter 1 program improvement.

There is also a state compensatory education program that is organized around the provisions of Chapter 1. It is entirely coordinated with Chapter 1 at the site level so it is difficult to make a distinction between the two. The SEA discourages separate services; however, the myth that it is necessary to keep Chapter 1 a separate program can cause major problems. The monitoring, funding, application, and operation of the services are all coordinated and consolidated.

In order to improve the linkages with early childhood programs, the SEA will be undertaking an effort to coordinate Even Start, Preschools, and Head Start as the SEA role in Even Start increases. The SEA has organized a task force with representatives from all areas in the SEA that impact these services.

Guidance regarding coordination of Chapter 1 with limited-English-proficient (LEP) and special education services is included in all advisories, instructions, workshop presentations, and technical assistance to LEAs. At the state level, the SEA engages in a number of department activities which coordinate all of these programs. The SEA has a policy that describes the conditions of LEP students receiving Chapter 1 services and includes the identification process LEAs can use and parameters of service.

Because of program improvement, there is more direct contact with schools by local school districts and the SEA.

Making a Difference School by School

Schoolwide Project at Vineland Elementary School (K-4), Vineland School District

The town of Weed Patch in Kern County, the movie location for Steinbeck's "Grapes of Wrath," is the home of Vineland School. Within the town is a labor camp which is open or closed according to the time of year. At the time of the visit in March, three classrooms were to remain closed until the children of migrant families returned in April from Mexico and Texas.

The seasonal labor camp, open April to September, opened 30 additional units in 1989, enlarging the camp by one-third. The unique educational problems created by this temporary housing pattern was further compounded by expansion. The LEP student population has grown by 35 percent over the last five years, a significantly faster rate than the overall population. In spite of these problems, achievement of Vineland School has improved significantly over the last five years.

With an 86 percent concentration of students from low-income families, Vineland is able to use Chapter 1 funds schoolwide. All Chapter 1 services are provided in the regular classroom. Services are concentrated in the lower

grades where most of the LEP students are concentrated and where students are learning to read. Classes are heterogeneous but regrouped within each class into flexible high, middle, and low groups. Aides are used to provide reading, writing, oral language, math reinforcement, and individual tutoring when needed. Close monitoring of student progress is done by the principal, using test scores, reading program monitoring, teacher conferences, child study team meetings, and parent conferences. Language arts is a program with a clear focus and it is implemented with productive results.

The key to the school's success is the principal as a person and leader. Although the principal shares the leadership role with the Chapter 1 resource teacher and other staff members, she is the mobilizer who sets the pace and inspires without pushing; those around her catch her enthusiasm. She also monitors staff development and ensures that teachers and aides are properly inserviced through activities based on need. In the words of the visiting team member, "It is amazing the way a school can be so geographically remote and yet so upbeat."

In every Program Quality Review report on Vineland, school climate is noted as an area of strength. A well-defined, consistently enforced discipline program compliments and reinforces the group's qualities. During the team visit, for example, the atmosphere was pleasant and positive. The staff members enjoy their work because they see the successful results of what they do. The principal is very involved in what teachers are doing.

Two other unique features are the language development block and the Home Pack. All language development instruction is scheduled at the same time for all classrooms which allows more efficient use of the reading teacher, aides, and tutors, as well as for better management of "inter-classroom grouping." For example, a student from one second-grade class may go to another class for reading because the first class might not have a group that is appropriate for the student.

The Home Packs are homework tasks sent home on a weekly basis. Parents are asked to ensure that the Pack is completed and returned. Parents may listen to students read or listen to book reports and sign a "credit," verifying the report. Parents are contacted if homework is not being turned in, if classroom assignments are not being completed, or if special assistance is needed at home to reinforce schoolwork or homework. This has worked in bringing the home close to school and vice versa.

Program Improvement at Cassell Elementary School, Alum Rock Unified School District

The Alum Rock district identified Cassell Elementary School for program improvement in June 1990. The first year was devoted to planning by the Leadership Team which was composed of the principal, resource teacher, and four classroom teachers. The assigned consultant from the Compensatory Education Office worked with the school and other schools within the region to develop their site plan. The focus of the plan is on curriculum, instruction, and assessment; parent involvement; staff development; and school climate. This is a three-year plan that can be updated as necessary.

The program improvement activities are in language arts and math. The decision to focus on these two areas for improvement was based on the results of the CAP, which reflects the curriculum standards, frameworks, and textbooks/materials adopted by the State Board. Specifically, in grade 3, two of the four skill areas were identified as needing improvement. All grade levels need to work on improving reasoning skills and vocabulary development. An integrated thematic approach will be used in all classrooms. The CAP data showed that there was overall growth in mathematics but multiplication, measurement skills, and problem-solving skills needed improvement.

As a result of the needs assessment, it was decided that the school would implement an extended-day, computer/math program for grades 4 and 5, additional manipulatives for all grades, and teacher in-service on the use of manipulatives. Related computer software that focuses on advanced skills is also being used.

The language arts services includes an extended-day K-5 program with reading enrichment, oral language, vocabulary development, and Sheltered English strategies. There is also a Home Involvement Reading program for K-3. Finally, whole-language and thematic instruction are being used. Portfolio use is planned for implementation.

The above activities are accomplished through increased staff articulation, regularly planned staff meetings, voluntary grade-level adjustments for staff members, peer observation and modeling, and team teaching.

The district supports this plan by assisting with formative evaluation data, diagnostic assessments of grade level and classroom summaries, research on current intervention techniques, monitoring support to the school, observations in the classroom, provision for technical assistance in assessment deficits, and assistance with the development of the program improvement action plan. All of the above activities are planned for three years.

Parent involvement activities include support for the achievement of their students, positive discipline, skills to build healthy relationships with children, and consistent and effective communications between the school and the parents. These initiatives are reflected in the strategic plan of the district, which is mandated by state law.

Coordination of Chapter 1 with LEP, special education, and regular curriculum is accomplished by using flexible groupings based on student needs, total staff in-service on Sheltered English strategies, thematic teaching approaches and whole language, ongoing monitoring of Chapter 1 and regular services, continuous meeting of the Leadership Team, and the formation of staff articulation strategies for informal coordination of services.

Colorado

Chapter 1 Participation and Funding Summary

Participation Levels in School Year (SY) 1990-91

Number of Children Served:	37,800
Percentage of K-12 Children Served:	7%
Number and Percentage of School Districts Receiving Chapter 1 Assistance:	175; 99%
Number and Percentage of Schools Receiving Chapter 1 Assistance:	616; 46%

Chapter 1 Services by Grade Span in SY 1990-91

Preschool	5%
Kindergarten	5%
Grades 1-3	44%
Grades 4-6	27%
Grades 7-12	19%

State Funding Levels by School Year

Formula Grants Allocation SY 1990-91, 1991-92:	$42,950,446; $44,320,124
Formula Grants Allocation SY 1992-93:	$48,859,825
Chapter 1 Per Pupil Expenditure SY 1990-91:	$1,028
Program Improvement Allocation SY 1991-92; 1992-93:	$115,009; $190,264

Chapter 1 Program Improvement Summary

Number of Schools in Program Improvement in SY 1991-92

Total Number of Schools in Program Improvement:	216
Percentage of Chapter 1 Schools in Program Improvement:	35%
Number of Schools in Joint Planning:	12

Statewide Minimum Standards for Improvement–A normal curve equivalent (NCE) gain of one in both basic and advanced skills, and success meeting at least one locally determined desired outcome.

Chapter 1 Program Improvement

Leveraging Accountability and Higher Performance

The Chapter 1 program improvement process has had substantial impact on the improvement of education for at-risk students in Colorado. Because agreed-upon standards must be met, the Chapter 1 requirements have been taken seriously at the local level. Programs have been spruced up in ways that clearly benefit children. The following examples demonstrate the direct results of employing program improvement standards.

One year-round school, identified for program improvement when test scores dropped, discovered that the Chapter 1 pupils were not receiving the same number of days of Chapter 1 instruction as in the general school program because the Chapter 1 teacher was on a nine-month contract from September through May. Thus, Chapter 1 students who were on a different track were not receiving services during the summer months. Several program adjustments were made, including the extension of the Chapter 1 teacher's contract to a full 12-month period.

Other examples of changes and significant improvements include selection of children for Chapter 1 and accuracy of placement; assignment of competent, high-quality Chapter 1 teachers; scheduling of tests to avoid other calendar events; selection of tests in congruence with the curriculum; program improvement as a vehicle to mobilize the school around improving the achievement of disadvantaged children; program improvement to increase the professional knowledge and understanding of non-Chapter 1 staff on teaching disadvantaged children; and schoolwide collaborative efforts to identify and use a greater variety of resources and services.

The fact that program improvement funds are available helps ease the sting often felt by schools when they are first identified for improvement. Program improvement is a process that should be continued, appropriately funded, and enlarged as a model for all schools where children are not doing well.

The Colorado State Plan requires desired outcomes to be expressed in terms of aggregate performance. The Plan goes beyond statutory requirements to strongly encourage local education agencies (LEAs) to include at least one other desired outcome in their Chapter 1 application specifically relating to their own Chapter 1 projects. The Plan contains a section that lists other objective measures such as criterion-referenced tests, performance assessments, teacher rating scales, and improved grades, which may be used in addition to standardized achievement tests.

The state, in consultation with the Committee of Practitioners (COP), raised the statewide minimum NCE gain to two beginning with the 1992-93 school year. After reviewing data collected for the 1992-93 school year, the state, in con-

sultation with the COP, will consider setting a minimum gain of three NCEs for school year 1993-94.

Statewide Technical Assistance

To support and assist with establishing locally determined desired outcomes, the state education agency (SEA) Chapter 1 staff and the Technical Assistance Center (TAC) provide workshops, meetings, and written materials to the LEAs.

The SEA, in cooperation with the Chapter 1 TAC, provides technical assistance to schools identified for program improvement through a series of three regional workshops held throughout the state. Schools send a team of teachers, administrators, and parents to the training sessions for personalized instruction on program planning and improvement. The TAC-developed workshop, entitled "For the Children," has been especially successful in effecting program improvement outcomes at the local sites. At the request of the SEA, the Chapter 1 TAC is preparing a "Starter Kit for Program Improvement," which will guide school principals and staff through the program improvement process.

State Chapter 1 staff members schedule on-site visits and provide individual consultation to the schools, both on request and according to identified need.

Successful Models

The SEA has long emphasized the importance of improved achievement in advanced skills. In 1984, for example, under a special Secretary's Initiative Grant, the SEA developed an instrument for use by LEAs called "The Chapter 1 Instructional Quality Indicators" (IQI), a needs assessment device for assessing Chapter 1 program quality in reading as well as comprehension, applications, synthesis, and analysis in mathematics. This instrument has been widely disseminated through workshops, meetings, and on-site visits. Continued implementation of the strategies and techniques from the IQI have been observed during on-site visits.

Chapter 1 on-site program reviews always include a focus on program quality supported by the "size, scope, and quality" provision of the law. Quality is highlighted in both the on-site comments and written reports.

The practice of inviting Chapter 1 teachers and administrators from neighboring districts to participate in on-site program reviews has been particularly effective in disseminating high-quality practices. The SEA also works with small, geographically distant LEAs to sponsor "cluster meetings" where Chapter 1 staff, parents, and other school staff (e.g., special education teachers) share ideas on effective teaching practices and emphasize advanced skill development.

Curriculum models in program improvement schools include using the "whole language" philosophy, a literature-based approach that integrates the reading and writing processes by teaching in a context that is meaningful to the children. Independent reading is encouraged outside of school through increased parental involvement, use of public libraries, and the reading of nonfiction books on topics of particular interest to the pupil. Reading in the content areas is receiving more emphasis in grade 4 and above.

Some schools have used the TESA (Teacher Expectations and Student Achievement program) to teach staff members how to set goals and communicate these goals to their pupils.

Other successful models include: the annual statewide Parent Involvement Conference, now in its 23rd year, which features sessions for parents and teachers on developing advanced skills; the development of advanced skills, which are regularly featured in the SEA newsletter, the Chapter 1 Beacon, and at Chapter 1 directors meetings; and the use of TAC staff to present local Chapter 1 workshops encouraged and coordinated by the SEA.

Exiting Program Improvement

The SEA encourages the few schools that tested out of program improvement before fully implementing their plans to continue in the program improvement process in order to sustain the effort they had begun. The SEA also emphasizes to the staff as well as to the students the value of program improvement and of taking advantage of available funds.

Joint SEA/LEA Plans

In Colorado, the process of developing joint plans is in the early stages. The SEA provides individual consultation with the LEA central office staff and staff of each identified school to review topics that include: the current program and the impact of recent changes; evaluation instruments and data; the unique characteristics of the school; the type of support provided by the LEA central office; the setting of appropriate goals, objectives, and strategies for meeting goals; and a process for ongoing assessment.

Funding for Program Improvement

All of the FY91 program improvement funds were distributed by the end of April. Ninety-eight percent of the program improvement funds are being used for mini-grants to LEAs. Approximately 30 percent of Chapter 1 state administrative staff time is devoted to program improvement responsibilities, 98 percent of which is supported with Chapter 1 state administrative funds.

Compliance monitoring has been extended from a three- to a five-year cycle in order to devote more time to program improvement. When an LEA appears on the monitoring cycle, the monitoring team schedules a visit to program improvement schools as part of the on-site review. In addition, all monitoring visits address program quality issues directly related to the goals of program improvement.

Increasing Capacity for School Improvement

With only three staff members overseeing 108 Chapter 1 programs serving 175 school districts along with 216 individual schools in some phase of program improvement, the need for increased fiscal support and more state-level Chapter 1 staff is evident. The SEA estimates that,

at minimum, 35 percent of staff time should be spent on program improvement, yet other Chapter 1 program and administrative requirements make this impossible. Additional assistance would allow the SEA staff to spend more time effecting schoolwide change, developing joint program improvement plans, and designing and implementing databases for testing and statewide performance data management. It would also allow the SEA to keep better track of the progress individual schools are making with program improvement.

Additional Chapter 1 Innovation and Reform

Schoolwide Projects

Number of schoolwide projects in Colorado by school year:

1989-90	1
1990-91	2
1991-92	2

In the 1990-91 school year, eight schools were eligible for schoolwide projects.

Because the state has few schools that meet the 75 percent low-income requirement, the SEA does not emphasize the development of schoolwide projects other than to present the design to those eligible schools and describe the implementation of the two current schoolwide projects at directors meetings.

Technical assistance to schools currently implementing schoolwide projects is provided through on-site consultation by the SEA and the Chapter 1 Rural Technical Assistance Center (RTAC).

Changes undertaken through schoolwide projects include: reduced teacher/pupil ratios, greater use of heterogeneous groups, team teaching with the Chapter 1 funded teacher serving as a team member along with regular classroom teachers, longer time blocks for reading/language arts, greater use of technology in the classroom, increased variety of reading and math materials to motivate and teach children, skills taught in context rather than as isolated skill and drill, more collaboration and communication between staff members emphasizing the needs of disadvantaged children, more parental involvement in their children's education, and increased articulation between the preschool and primary classes.

The SEA makes the following projections of the number of schools in the state that would be eligible for schoolwide projects if the low-income eligibility thresholds were reduced from 75 percent to the following levels: 46 schools at 60 percent, 84 schools at 50 percent, and 170 schools at 40 percent.

The Chapter 1 program improvement process in Colorado has encouraged local and state partnerships and has infused greater energy in improving and sustaining Chapter 1 program quality.

Coordination with the Regular Classroom

The SEA is unrelenting in its insistence that schools coordinate Chapter 1 services with those of the regular classroom. The LEA must describe in its Chapter 1 application the time and resources to be allotted for coordination of the Chapter 1 and regular classroom curriculum, as well as with special education, limited-English-proficient (LEP), and adult literacy programs. On-site program visits review the implementation of these coordination activities, which are addressed in the follow-up report.

Coordination is a regular agenda item at Chapter 1 directors meetings and teacher workshops as well as a topic in Chapter 1 newsletters. Chapter 1 directors may provide in-service training to regular classroom teachers who have Chapter 1 children in their classes. The teachers are also a part of the planning team that develops Chapter 1 school improvement plans and participates in training provided by the SEA and the TAC.

Chapter 1 coordination has become a standard component of all teachers' schedules. Documentation of coordination interactions is kept and reviewed regularly to maintain continuity and cohesiveness in the child's instructional program. Teachers also confer when selecting curriculum topics and content.

The SEA neither encourages nor discourages LEAs provision of Chapter 1 services in the regular classroom. Rather, the LEA is asked to base the program design, in-class or pull-out, on meeting the needs of the children. Colorado has outstanding Chapter 1 projects that use both designs, although aggregate performance results still favor a pullout design in reading and mathematics.

Statewide Coordination

The State Board of Education's goals, *Colorado 2000,* and the Chapter 1 goals are mutually supportive and are addressed in Chapter 1 meetings, workshops, reports, and newsletters.

State law requires all public schools to develop annual school improvement plans. To assist with this school accountability and improvement process, local Chapter 1 directors are regularly reminded to share the needs assessment information collected for Chapter 1 in reading, math, and language arts with the principals of all eligible schools. The school plans are compiled into a district-wide improvement plan and sent to the SEA. Chapter 1 staff members review these plans in the fall and strive to encourage more coordination with the Chapter 1 program.

SEA Chapter 1 staff has developed a school improvement plan format and will work with the Field Services Unit, which oversees the state accountability process, to develop a coordinated school improvement plan.

Through the provision of staff development and parent training, the SEA coordinates Chapter 1 program

improvement efforts with Chapter 2, the Eisenhower Mathematics and Science Act, special education, and bilingual education programs.

The SEA Chapter 1 staff reviews Chapter 1 forms annually with a view toward cutting and streamlining administrative/paperwork requirements while maintaining the necessary documentation and information requirements. Every form developed by the SEA for LEA use must be reviewed annually by a locally representative "committee of practitioners" called the DARU (data acquisition, review and utilization) committee. Forms may be modified in accordance with the committee's recommendations and, with a DARU stamp, may be disseminated to the field.

SEA staff members from all the programs that fund preschools have developed an early childhood program position statement that focuses on collaboration and coordination. The statement has been approved by the State Board and disseminated widely throughout the state. To further program coordination and collaboration, a one-day conference was held in December 1990 to highlight the practices of eight LEAs administering successful preschool programs. State and local staff from Chapter 1, special education, the Colorado Preschool Project (CPP), and Head Start were all represented.

Coordination with child care providers, Chapter 1, CPP, and preschool services for homeless youngsters has been a topic of other meetings. Plans are being developed to support several of these coordinated efforts in the FY 93 applications.

The SEA encourages the use of Chapter 1 funds for preschool and early primary years by distributing research data showing the long-term effectiveness of such programs at meetings and workshops and in the Chapter 1 newsletter. Several LEAs currently focus on the early grades and collect long-term data on effectiveness. They are readily accessible models for other districts to observe.

The Colorado Chapter 1 Handbook for Administrators and Teachers, prepared by Chapter 1 SEA staff, contains guidance about coordinating special education and limited-English-proficiency (LEP) programs. The handbook states that "good communication and cooperative planning should lead to coordination in the areas of student selection, testing, scheduling and instructional procedures."

The Chapter 1 application requires that LEA applicants describe how they will coordinate Chapter 1 with special education and LEP programs. Implementation of coordination activities is reviewed during on-site program visits.

The criteria used for selecting LEP students for Chapter 1 services is addressed in the *Colorado Chapter 1 Handbook for Administrators and Teachers.*

Through the use of uniform criteria, the LEA selects children for participation on the basis of educational deprivation (in reading, math, and/or language arts), not on the basis of limited English proficiency. A child's inability to read should not be based solely on his/her lack of English speaking skills in order to be eligible for Chapter 1 services.

Periodic meetings with SEA staff involved in Chapter 1 and English-as-a-second language (ESL)/bilingual programs focus on coordination, clarification, and collaboration in serving children who qualify for bilingual services.

The trend in special education is toward the use of a consultative model that strives to strengthen the regular classroom teacher's skills in working with handicapped youngsters, rather than providing direct services to those children. As a result of this change in philosophy and practice, children having mild disabilities similar to Chapter 1 characteristics are served more often in Chapter 1 programs. In order to maintain close communication about the different types of service delivery, meetings of Chapter 1 and special education staff at both the state and local levels have been held to discuss and resolve placement issues.

Making a Difference School by School

Schoolwide Project at Hyde Park Elementary School, Pueblo

Now in its third year as a schoolwide project, the Hyde Park Elementary School is a good example of Chapter 1 making a difference. The school, with a 67 percent Hispanic population, has been structured into three teams with a Chapter 1 teacher on each team. Chapter 1 funded teachers each serve as regular classroom teachers, working with classes of heterogeneously mixed children. The student-teacher ratio has been reduced significantly. All teachers are knowledgeable about the schoolwide project and feel that it has resulted in more successful teamwork.

The teams meet regularly to discuss the progress of students. Student records are color-coded so that all teachers know which children have been identified as eligible for Chapter 1. Student progress is observed and special help is given as needed. Chapter 1 identified students are occasionally pulled out of "specials" and given extra help in reading.

The Chapter 1-funded teachers hold parent meetings to discuss the nature of the schoolwide project and to get parental input. They also present parent workshops on study skills and reading aloud to children. Home visits are occasionally made by the principal and Chapter 1 funded teachers when parents are unable to attend the meetings. A voice message system is utilized by the school so that parents can telephone in to receive their children's homework assignments.

Health problems are a major concern, so a part-time nurse has been hired to work with students and parents to promote healthy practices and reduce absences.

Annual testing shows that Hyde Park Chapter 1-identified students are making greater gains in reading than the Chapter 1 students in the eleven other Pueblo

Chapter 1 schools. First-year gains were 6.17 NCEs in basic skills and 8.47 NCEs in advanced skills. The second-year gains were even better: 10.52 NCEs in basic skills and 12.20 NCEs in advanced skills.

Formal testing results do not show the whole picture, but when paired with the current positive school climate, this schoolwide project is making a significant difference.

Program Improvement at Wiggins Elementary School, Wiggins

Wiggins Elementary School is implementing a school program improvement plan for mathematics based on evaluation data from the 1990-91 school year.

The process of developing a plan resulted in a number of changes. The new principal involved the entire staff in discussions regarding the goals and objectives of Chapter 1 and the program improvement plan. Staff members now release Chapter 1 students for services five days per week for a minimum of thirty minutes, whereas previously, some students were served for shorter amounts of time.

In addition, the Chapter 1 math teacher and paraprofessional time was increased from 0.5 to 1.5 full-time equivalent (FTE) which allows more students to be served. A new teacher is tailoring instruction to meet individual student needs. The Chapter 1 math project, now in its second year, is better equipped with manipulative and other materials designed to assist students in meeting their objectives.

The Chapter 1 staff has crafted a plan for ongoing staff development. Previously the staff was inexperienced and lacked training. They have benefited from in-services, math cluster meetings and math conferences. Also, a new math teacher for grades 5 and 6 is focusing on problem solving and improved coordination with the Chapter 1 math staff.

Wiggins learned that scheduling testing for the day after daylight savings time began did not produce good results. The students were sleepy and unmotivated. Consequently, a better plan for scheduling testing has been implemented.

In summary, the school improvement planning process sensitized the entire staff about the need of Chapter 1 students for quality instruction, a stable schedule, continuous staff development, a reasonable testing situation, and the reality that decisions made in haste can adversely affect Chapter 1 student achievement.

Connecticut

Chapter 1 Participation and Funding Summary

Participation Levels in School Year (SY) 1990-91

Number of Children Served:	50,123
Percentage of K-12 Children Served:	11%
Number and Percentage of School Districts Receiving Chapter 1 Assistance:	165; 99%
Number and Percentage of Schools Receiving Chapter 1 Assistance:	618; 63%

Chapter 1 Services by Grade Span in SY 1990-91

Preschool	4%
Kindergarten	5%
Grades 1-3	35%
Grades 4-6	30%
Grades 7-12	26%

State Funding Levels by School Year

Formula Grants Allocation SY 1990-91, 1991-92:	$50,454,091; $58,508,383
Formula Grants Allocation SY 1992-93:	$64,153,157
Chapter 1 Per Pupil Expenditure SY 1990-91:	$1,006
Program Improvement Allocation SY 1991-92; 1992-93:	$150,645; $248,545

Chapter 1 Program Improvement Summary

Number of Schools in Program Improvement in SY 1991-92

Total Number of Schools in Program Improvement:	61
Percentage of Chapter 1 Schools in Program Improvement:	10%
Number of Schools in Joint Planning:	1

Statewide Minimum Standards for Improvement–Achievement of at least a positive normal curve equivalent (NCE) gain and an aggregate posttest of at least 32 NCEs in advanced skills for Chapter 1 reading, mathematics and language arts projects grades 2-12; and achievement of a desired outcome determined at the local level for all other projects.

Chapter 1 Program Improvement

Leveraging Accountability and Higher Performance

The Connecticut State Department of Education has revised its state plan for program improvement, which until now included the minimum required aggregate standard. The new additional standard will require identification of every Chapter 1 reading, mathematics, and language arts project, grades 2 to 12, which has an aggregate posttest in more advanced skills of less than 32 NCEs at the school level.

Numerous alternative standards had been explored with the Chapter 1 Committee of Practitioners (COP)over the past three years, including one based on the Connecticut Mastery Test, in an attempt to establish a higher standard that would address two concerns with current standards: too many high-achieving schools and too few low-achieving schools were being identified under the current standard; and there was too much annual movement of schools in and out of program improvement, which resulted in lack of continuity in improvement strategies for students.

The new standard was chosen because the state education agency (SEA) believes it will bring more of the lowest-performing schools into program improvement, retain the lowest-achieving schools in program improvement until achievement is above an acceptable level, not identify additional high- or medium-achieving schools, and be easy to implement.

Statewide Technical Assistance

The SEA has provided on-site technical assistance, workshops, and assistance by telephone in the following areas: objective setting; data collection, aggregation, disaggregation, and analysis; planning for program improvement; implementing program improvement plans; the development of advanced skills; the adoption of successful models; and use of program improvement funds. In addition, six districts with a total of nine schools have been included in the Connecticut Effective Schools Program and have received additional grants under Chapter 2 Schoolwide Program Improvement.

In all interactions with school districts, every attempt is made to minimize the potential negative impact at the local level that often accompanies identification of schools for program improvement. Districts and schools with positive attitudes and success stories are invited to spread the word at workshops and conferences and through informal communications with other schools and districts. This effort has met with mixed results so far.

In general, the SEA staff is seeing more cooperative learning, more in-class

instructional models, and a re-emphasis on early childhood education as school districts attempt to address their program improvement needs. Additionally, evaluation designs are being reviewed simultaneously in order to accurately evaluate program progress.

Exiting Program Improvement

The proposed standards for 1992-93 will identify very low-performing schools that currently avoid program improvement because they are making the minimum NCE gains. It is anticipated that they will stay in program improvement longer than do schools identified under the current standards. Schools that exit program improvement before fully implementing their plans are encouraged by the SEA, both on-site and by telephone, to continue through the process even if they are not required to do so.

Joint SEA/LEA Plans

The Connecticut State Department of Education has established a joint plan with one local educational agency (LEA). Weekly telephone calls in addition to on-site technical assistance visits have occurred in preparation for development and implementation of a joint plan. Because there are four Chapter 1 projects in this school, additional Chapter 1 program improvement funds have been targeted to this school. Local and state resources have been channeled to this school. The joint plan has been created by persons from all levels of the school system. It is too early to determine the results of this intense intervention.

Funding for Program Improvement

All program improvement funds are currently disseminated as mini-grants to school districts.

The Department anticipates using all of the 1990-91 program improvement funds by early spring. Federal restrictions requiring the agreement of school-level staff and parents of participating children in the proposed expenditures of funds preclude all state-level expenditures of program improvement funds. Therefore, the Department finds itself with surplus 1991-92 program improvement funds for which the local school districts have not applied. Districts open to program improvement opportunities welcome the funds. Others avoid the public aspect of attaining local board approval for application for funds for which they may or may not believe they are truly eligible.

The Department faces extreme demands on state administration staff time for technical assistance related to program improvement for which the State Department of Education is unable to use program improvement funds. Limited state administrative funds and current state hiring procedures preclude hiring consultants with administrative funds in anticipation of reimbursement with program improvement funds. A recent agreement has been reached between the Department, the COP, the local Association of Chapter 1 Coordinators and the Technical Assistance Center, to provide statewide program improvement conferences to teams of staff from all schools identified for program improvement in 1992-93.

Approximately 30-40 percent of Chapter 1 state administration staff time is devoted to program improvement. With a caseload of forty school districts, each consultant has approximately ten to fifteen schools in various stages of program improvement.

As a result of increased attention devoted to program improvement, the Department has been forced to cut back on Chapter 1 curriculum workshops and conferences, parental involvement activities, and technical workshops on applications and comparability.

Program compliance reviews now take place only once every four years instead of once every three years, regardless of district size. This will be reduced even further in 1992-93 to once every five years. As a result, coordinating Chapter 1 monitoring and compliance requirements with Chapter 1 program improvement goals is not done as regularly as necessary. Program improvement is perceived, and rightly so, as technical assistance service rather than strictly compliance.

Increasing Capacity for School Improvement

Additional state assistance is crucial to the success of this endeavor in the areas of: identification of projects in need of program improvement, data disaggregation and analysis, program improvement planning and implementation, and staff development. Further, program improvement cannot be limited solely to Chapter 1 programs. In many instances, the regular curriculum and instruction must be changed; and in some cases, total school restructuring is necessary.

Additional Chapter 1 Innovation and Reform

Schoolwide Projects

There never have been and currently are no schoolwide projects in Connecticut. However, there were eight schools in the state eligible for schoolwide projects in the 1990-91 school year. The Department is encouraging the three LEAs that have schools eligible for schoolwide projects to participate in the national conferences that describe the advantages of schoolwide projects. Individual consultants encourage their districts to participate and at least one district will attempt the move during the next school year.

It is anticipated that the impact of maintenance of effort requirements will greatly affect schoolwide project implementation as state and local budgets decrease. LEAs are already feeling the effects of state budget reductions and the 1992-93 school year is likely to be worse.

The following are estimates of the number of schools that would be eligible for schoolwide projects if the low-income eligibility threshold were lowered from 75 percent to the following levels: 24 schools at 60 percent, 44 schools at 50 percent, and 61 schools at 40 percent. If

districts opt to determine low-income status by using free and reduced lunch counts instead of AFDC, these numbers will increase considerably.

Coordination with the Regular Classroom

Department Chapter 1 consultants have been aggressively encouraging LEAs to re-evaluate their current delivery of Chapter 1 services. Local school districts have been given surveys to examine the effectiveness of their programs, particularly coordination of efforts with regular classrooms. This program quality issue is also being addressed through the program compliance and quality review process. Districts scheduled for review must describe their efforts toward coordinating regular classroom services with Chapter 1 services.

Department Chapter 1 consultants have been aggressively encouraging LEAs to re-evaluate their current delivery of Chapter 1 services.

Coordination with the regular classroom has not been looked at relative to the location of Chapter 1 services, such as pull-out or in-class approaches, but rather through statewide efforts to encourage districts to better prepare all school staff to meet the needs of at-risk students. Some in-service training has been coupled with the Effective Schools initiatives and the reading/language arts initiatives in order to better effect change in the curriculum for all children in Chapter 1 schools.

Statewide Coordination

Chapter 1 program improvement has fostered increased collaboration between Department staff from a number of different areas. Chapter 1 administrative staff and evaluation/assessment staff have worked together closely on establishing state policies and procedures and providing workshops and technical assistance to local school districts. Every attempt was made to coordinate federal evaluation requirements with state mastery test needs. This effort, however, was not approved at the federal level.

The SEA has targeted its State Compensatory Education Program to the 20 neediest districts in the state, whereas in previous years all districts qualified. The application for funds is part of the application process for Chapter 1 funds. The same state staff members administer both programs. The goals and monitoring requirements are similar in that the state funds must be used to provide supplemental basic skills instruction to students identified as being in most need of such instruction. No funds have been appropriated for the State Compensatory Education Program for the 1992-93 school year.

Curriculum specialists in mathematics and reading/language arts provide frequent assistance and specialized workshops to local Chapter 1 staff. In addition, Chapter 1 staff are encouraged to attend the statewide reading, mathematics, bilingual/English for speakers of other languages, and early childhood conferences.

Connecticut's Priority School District program, now in its seventh year, focuses on the twelve educationally and economically neediest districts in the state. There is some overlap with schools identified for program improvement under Chapter 1, though not as much as the state would like. Priority School Districts are selected using Connecticut Mastery Test standards while Chapter 1 schools are selected using norm-referenced test aggregate gain scores. Due to federal evaluation requirements, the state is limited in its ability to leverage truly needed changes in the most needy schools in curriculum, regular education instruction, and school restructuring through Chapter 1. Therefore, the state has continued its efforts in Priority School Districts, Effective Schools, and Chapter 2.

Program improvement efforts have been coordinated with Effective Schools and Chapter 2 through school improvement activities. Schools identified as needing Chapter 1 program improvement have received monetary and professional assistance through Chapter 2 and the Effective Schools initiatives. These efforts are long-term, not one-shot interventions. In-service and technical assistance are ongoing, coordinated efforts with the Department Chapter 1 staff and School Effectiveness and Chapter 2 staff. Local district administrators feel that the development of comprehensive plans, Chapter 1 program improvement, and Chapter 2 school improvement are related. Needs assessments for Chapter 1 may yield information to framers of the comprehensive school plan and also contribute relevant information on compensatory education needs for schools undergoing school effectiveness training. Also, compliance monitoring is coordinated across all federal and state programs.

The majority of early childhood programs are currently funded by Chapter 1. One Chapter 1 administrative staff member is assigned to an early childhood initiative with the Department's Early Childhood Unit.

Where Head Start programs are sponsored by LEAs, it is not unusual for Chapter 1 funds to augment the district's early education initiative. In line with the first goal of *America 2000*, the Chapter 1 state staff has been actively encouraging districts to re-examine their current use of funds in relation to the early education needs of their students. As a result, many districts have focused their Chapter 1 funds on grades K-2, using a preventive rather than remedial approach.

Districts are anticipating the use of Even Start funds next year and are seek-

ing local funds to assist the early intervention effort. The state regional service centers have not only encouraged the establishment of early intervention projects, but have also called upon the state Chapter 1 staff to promote the use of Even Start funds for this purpose.

The Compensatory Education Unit has been working collaboratively with bilingual education staff for over a year and has begun such a collaboration with special education staff. Through program improvement efforts, the state has been able to promote and effect change relative to the use of all special program funds. Providers of special education services, Chapter 1 services, and bilingual education services have attempted to coordinate their instruction and the delivery of instruction with the classroom teacher. This coordination effort arises from the newly recognized need to serve an at-risk student through the classroom teacher as much as possible with continual support from special needs teachers.

Students are selected for Chapter 1 services regardless of their handicapping condition or language dominance if they meet Chapter 1 eligibility requirements. The state is currently attempting to promote joint recommendations of service to students requiring bilingual, special education, and/or Chapter 1 services.

Making a Difference School by School

Program Improvement at Verplank Elementary School, Manchester

Verplank School was identified for program improvement based on 1989-90 reading comprehension achievement on norm referenced tests in grades 2-5.

The school, as a whole, had improved test scores that year on the Connecticut Mastery Test at grade 4, so the program improvement outcomes were unexpected.

Prior to the 1990-91 school year, there was a districtwide effort to modify the language arts curriculum and corresponding instructional approaches. The district, for the first time, held a workshop with elementary principals, reading consultants, classroom teaches, and Chapter 1 reading consultants. With the Connecticut Effective Schools Model, the state language arts consultant, the Effective Schools consultant, and the state Chapter 1 consultant acting as facilitators, the district examined the language arts curriculum in light of current research and evaluation results with particular emphasis on examining at-risk students' needs. As a result, the district altered its curriculum to reflect a whole-language philosophy, integrating both language arts activities and the gradual movement towards a single reading basal for all children. The Chapter 1 reading program also was refocused to grades K-2 in order to prevent as many students as possible at an early age from reading failure. The Chapter 1 program focused on the pre-teaching of basal and classroom activities and providing assistance within the classroom.

K-1 students at Verplank had not received Chapter 1 support for over a decade. The school decided to focus on the need for instructional leadership from the school reading consultant, the Chapter 1 coordinator, and the school principal. The Chapter 1 reading teacher was given in-service training in reading instruction, whole-language philosophy, and coordination of efforts with classroom teachers. Classroom teachers took a major role in shaping not only their reading program but also the Chapter 1 program.

The school reading consultant was a change agent within the school, assisting in administering the Chapter 1 tests in order to get more objective and consistent test results and monitoring not only the progress of individual students but also the progress of the Chapter 1 teacher.

All Chapter 1 reading teachers within the district have been required to obtain reading/language arts consultant or remedial reading teacher state certification. The Chapter 1 teacher at Verplank school is encouraged to achieve either certificate by 1993.

The district Chapter 1 coordinator frequently calls upon the state Chapter 1 consultant for program observations and recommendations for in-service. The key to the progress made within Verplank has been the implementation of a language arts curriculum that meets the needs of all children and does not rely on Chapter 1 to make the difference. This school, like others in Manchester, has assumed responsibility for its students and is coordinating all student services. Based on 1990-91 data, Verplank School is no longer in program improvement.

Delaware

Chapter 1 Participation and Funding Summary

Participation Levels in School Year (SY) 1990-91

Number of Children Served:	10,162
Percentage of K-12 Children Served:	10%
Number and Percentage of School Districts Receiving Chapter 1 Assistance:	19, 100%
Number and Percentage of Schools Receiving Chapter 1 Assistance:	110, 65%

Chapter 1 Services by Grade Span in SY 1990-91

Preschool	<1%
Kindergarten	13%
Grades 1-3	56%
Grades 4-6	25%
Grades 7-12	5%

State Funding Levels by School Year

Formula Grants Allocation SY 1990-91, 1991-92:	$13,390,099; $15,851,874
Formula Grants Allocation SY 1992-93:	$17,136,722
Chapter 1 Per Pupil Expenditure SY 1990-91:	$1,318
Program Improvement Allocation SY 1991-92, 1992-93:	$90,000, $180,000

Chapter 1 Program Improvement Summary

Number of Schools in Program Improvement in SY 1991-92

Total Number of Schools in Program Improvement:	64
Percentage of Chapter 1 Schools in Program Improvement:	58%
Number of Schools in Joint Planning:	3

Statewide Minimum Standards for Improvement –A normal curve equivalent (NCE) gain equal to or greater than one in both advanced and basic skills.

Chapter 1 Program Improvement

Statewide Technical Assistance

The state education agency (SEA) Chapter 1 and regional Technical Assistance Center (TAC) staff members assist district and school Chapter 1 staff in developing desired outcomes through meetings and workshops with district Chapter 1 staff. The SEA has also requested that districts identify two or more desired outcomes beginning in 1992-93.

Once schools are identified for improvement, the state staff, in collaboration with the TAC and Research for Better Schools Inc., provides training and on-site technical assistance to Chapter 1 project coordinators, school principals, and school improvement teams. Technical assistance activities also include attending school improvement team meetings and advising school Chapter 1 staff.

To counter any negative reaction accompanying the identification of a school for program improvement, the SEA provides staff development institutes for project directors and principals. The institutes focus on the implementation of effective improvement programs. Additionally, the SEA has dedicated portions of bimonthly meetings with project coordinators to discuss program improvement.

Successful Models

Delaware's Chapter 1 program improvement schools have employed a number of instructional strategies and curriculum models. Parental involvement is the centerpiece of many successful models and many schools have established planning teams with regular teaching staff. A number of reading and math programs have also been used successfully in various schools, and some have instituted integrated computer systems.

To emphasize the development of advanced skills, SEA staff members encourage effective implementation of successful models.

Joint SEA/LEA Plans

After a school in Delaware has been notified of joint plan status, a number of staff members in the school are required to participate in extensive training activities provided by consultants and SEA staff. After this training, state staff provide individual, on-site consultation to schools, as needed, to assist them with developing an improvement plan that must eventually be approved by the SEA.

Funding for Program Improvement

The SEA devotes approximately one full-time equivalent person to the responsibilities of Chapter 1 program improvement. All of FY 91 program improvement funds have been distributed to date.

Increasing Capacity for School Improvement

The SEA believes that effective program improvement takes place when all of the adults working with Chapter 1 students plan activities for those children together. This planning effort requires planning time, staff development, and technical assistance from SEA consultants. With additional resources, the SEA would both increase the involvement of regular teachers and provide staff development for teachers on successful models for low-achieving children. The SEA would also fund activities to help school teams use their assessment data to support Chapter 1 program changes.

Additional Chapter 1 Innovation and Reform

Schoolwide Projects

The state currently has no schoolwide projects. The SEA estimates that if the low-income eligibility threshold were lowered from 75 percent to 40 percent, fewer than ten schools would become eligible for schoolwide projects.

Coordination with the Regular Classroom

The Delaware Department of Public Instruction strongly encourages local education agencies (LEAs) to provide Chapter 1 services in the regular classroom and to coordinate services with regular classroom teachers. The state staff emphasizes this concept at their training institutes for Chapter 1 coordinators and principals. The SEA has also asked schools to use planning teams composed of both Chapter 1 and regular classroom teachers to plan school improvement activities.

Statewide Coordination

To improve statewide coordination, the Chapter 1 program is located within the instructional division of the SEA. As such, other division staff members participate in Chapter 1 activities as part of a division-wide coordination effort. Collaborative activities include Chapter 1 program monitoring and project committee meetings.

To streamline Chapter 1 administrative and paperwork requirements, the SEA is planning to combine the regular and school improvement applications.

Chapter 1 staff and special education staff at the SEA have initiated discussions that will lead to state coordination of services. To enhance coordination between limited-English proficient (LEP) and Chapter 1 staff, a state policy for educating LEP students is being crafted and Chapter 1 staff is involved in the development process. LEP students are selected according to the same criteria and policies used to select Chapter 1 students.

To counter any negative reaction accompanying the identification of a school for program improvement, the SEA provides staff development institutes for project directors and principals.

Making a Difference School by School

Program Improvement at the DelMar Junior-Senior High School

After being identified for program improvement, Delmar High School wrote a plan that outlined two major objectives of program improvement: to provide more on-task time for Chapter 1 students by identifying them earlier and to refine parent involvement and instructional strategies. To achieve the first objective, the school identified potential Chapter 1 students at the end of their 7th and 8th grade years, rather than during the 9th grade. To achieve the second goal, the school provided a two-day in-service workshop in the summer for school improvement staff, Chapter 1 teachers and assistants, language teachers, and administrators in order to plan a strategy for the year and enhance awareness of the objectives of program improvement. During the workshops, participants also crafted a Parent Involvement Strategy, which became a centerpiece of their program improvement efforts.

Another component of the school improvement plan was a team visit to one or more secondary schools with successful Chapter 1 programs to refine and compare Delmar's programs. At the end of the year, a Review and Analysis Workshop was held to provide closure on program improvement planning.

District of Columbia

Chapter 1 Participation and Funding Summary

Participation Levels in School Year (SY) 1990-91

Number of Children Served:	14,436
Percentage of K-12 Children Served:	16%
Number and Percentage of School Districts Receiving Chapter 1 Assistance:	1; 100%
Number and Percentage of Schools Receiving Chapter 1 Assistance:	136; 52%

Chapter 1 Services by Grade Span in SY 1990-91

Preschool	0%
Kindergarten	18%
Grades 1-3	41%
Grades 4-6	24%
Grades 7-12	17%

State Funding Levels by School Year

Formula Grants Allocation SY 1990-91, 1991-92:	$22,021,751; $28,361,770
Formula Grants Allocation SY 1992-93:	$28,395,623
Chapter 1 Per Pupil Expenditure SY 1990-91:	$1,530
Program Improvement Allocation SY 1991-92, 1992-93:	$90,000; $180,000

Chapter 1 Program Improvement Summary

Number of Schools in Program Improvement in SY 1991-92

Total Number of Schools in Program Improvement:	64
Percentage of Chapter 1 Schools in Program Improvement:	24%
Number of Schools in Joint Planning:	0

Minimum Standards for Improvement–Substantial progress in achieving outcomes specified by the Board of Education of the D.C. Public Schools and a positive normal curve equivalent (NCE) gain in the main area of focus for the Chapter 1 program in each school at each level of instruction.

Chapter 1 Program Improvement

Leveraging Accountability and Higher Performance

Each desired outcome must be evaluated by the D.C. Public Schools using methods appropriate to the way the desired outcome is stated. For each project school, the local education agency (LEA) must review effectiveness on the basis of aggregate performance and substantial progress toward meeting the desired outcomes. Failure to make substantial progress toward meeting desired outcomes requires program improvement activities regardless of the results of aggregate performance. In other words, a school that does not make substantial progress annually on the stated desired outcomes will be required to develop a program improvement plan.

Statewide Technical Assistance

Assistance offered by the SEA includes, but is not limited to: training and retraining of personnel, adaptation or adoption of curricula that have shown promise, implementation of effective schools practices, improvement of coordination between programs assisted under Chapter 1 and the regular school program, development and implementation of schoolwide projects, and development of innovative strategies to enhance parental involvement.

Computer-assisted lab programs, staffed by trained teachers, paraprofessionals, and parent partners, support the regular curriculum in reading, writing, and mathematics instruction. The Reading Assistance for Mastery Program (RAMP) helps 9th graders to strengthen their reading and writing skills. Reading Recovery will provide developmental reading instruction for 1st graders in designated schools. Parent partners assist students in classrooms twice weekly.

Total staff in-service training assists school staff in designing strategies to better meet the needs of Chapter 1 students through schoolwide collaborative efforts. The Museum Project works in partnership with local and national museums located in the city to provide a variety of learning experiences in new environments that enhance classroom activities. The TAKE-A-TEACHER HOME Project employs individualized audio and videotaped lessons for at-home use. The FACTS Project is in selected schools and provides take-home computers on a loan basis to involve students and their families in skills reinforcement activities.

Chapter 1 projects serving non-public school children are eligible for program improvement services and funds. The LEA, in consultation with the non-public schools, determine these services

and add them as amendments to the annual update of its required three-year plan.

The LEA conducts an annual review of the effectiveness of its Chapter 1 projects for each Chapter 1 school and makes the results of the review available to teachers and parents of participating children and other appropriate parties, including principals of schools attended by Chapter 1 children.

Based on the annual review, the LEA identifies schools in need of program improvement and notifies those schools to enlist support in developing a program improvement plan. Each school-based plan describes how the school will modify or replace Chapter 1 programs that have not been successful; incorporate the program changes that have the greatest likelihood of improving performance of educationally deprived children; and provide a description of the resources and how these resources will be applied to carry out program improvement. This description could include use of funds for qualified personnel, in-service training, curriculum materials, equipment, physical facilities, technical assistance, alternative curriculum that has shown progress in similar schools, coordination between the Chapter 1 district school program and the regular school program, evaluation of parental involvement, appropriate in-service training for Chapter 1 staff and other staff who teach participating children, and other measures selected by LEA officials.

The D.C. Public Schools obtains the signature of the principal, a parent leader, a classroom teacher, a librarian, a Chapter 1 teacher, and the LEA Director or designee on the Program Improvement Plan; submits each school plan to the state education agency (SEA) to be forwarded to the Board of Education; makes the plan available to parents of participating children in each affected school; and develops a timeline for the implementation of each school's plan.

SEA/LEA Joint Plans

If a school is still identified as needing program inprovement after its plan has been in effect for one full year, the LEA, in cooperation with the SEA, will develop and implement a joint plan for program improvement. The joint plan will be developed and implemented in consultation with school staff and parents of participating children and must be approved by the Superintendent and the Board of Education before it is implemented. The plan will be reviewed and revised as necessary until improved performance is sustained for a full school year. Each revision is subject to the same approval as the original plan.

Funding for Program Improvement

The District of Columbia has received $90,000 for 1989-90 and $90,000 for 1990-91 to support local program improvement. One hundred percent of these funds have been distributed to date. Funds are targeted to provide direct services to schools based on the relative need of projects that are eligible for SEA program improvement services. Parents of participating children, the eligible school's administrator, and the LEA decide on the best use of these funds, and the SEA awards program improvement funds directly to the schools as appropriate.

Program improvement funds are allocated in one of the following ways for the duration of this plan: through an eligible school application submitted directly to the SEA after consultation with the community and the LEA; through an LEA application submitted to the SEA for program improvement assistance funds based on the program improvement plan or the joint SEA/LEA program improvement plan established in the eligible school's community; or through SEA assistance to identified schools and schools invited to apply for program assistance funds based upon available resources.

Additional Chapter 1 Innovation and Reform

Schoolwide Projects

Number of schoolwide projects in the District of Columbia by school year:

1989-90	0
1990-91	12
1991-92	16

During the 1990-91 school year there were 53 schools in the District of Columbia eligible for schoolwide projects.

Sixteen school sites have been identified for participation in FY 93 and have designed schoolwide plans. These plans will be reviewed for approval by the Chapter 1 staff, the Superintendent, and the Board of Education of the District of Columbia. At each schoolwide project site the staff, including the administrators, teachers, the librarian, aides, pupil support personnel, and parents, are involved in designing the schoolwide project plans. D.C. Public Schools require that schoolwide projects include the following:

- a comprehensive assessment of the educational needs of all students in the school, particularly the special needs of educationally deprived children,
- well-defined goals to meet the special needs of all students and ensure that educationally deprived children are served effectively and demonstrate performance gains that are comparable to the performance gains of other students,
- a description of the instructional program, pupil services, and procedures that will be used to implement the goals

The Museum Project works in partnership with local and national museums located in the city to provide a variety of learning experiences in new environments that enhance classroom activities.

of the schoolwide project (strategies, staff parents, materials and equipment, space, schedules, and timeline),

- a description of the specific uses of available funds,
- if appropriate, the description of the implementation of an Effective Schools program,
- the explicit involvement of individuals who will be engaged in implementing the plan, including parents, teachers (including a Chapter 1 teacher), librarians, educational aides, pupil services staff, and administrators,
- a description of consultation activities among the persons listed above concerning the educational progress of all students in the school and accountability measures,
- appropriate training for the parents of children to be served and all staff listed above to enable them to carry out the plan,
- procedures for measuring progress, and
- the signatures of the principal and team leader.

In addition to the statutory and regulatory requirements, the LEA requests that each school preface its plan with an introductory description of its school, population, and community.

At the end of the three-year participation period, an evaluation by the Research and Evaluation Branch will demonstrate and report the performance gains of students in each schoolwide project site that are comparable to the performance gains of other Chapter 1 students.

The LEA makes the following estimates of the number of schools that would be eligible for schoolwide projects if the low-income eligibility threshold were reduced from 75 percent to the following levels: 71 schools at 60 percent, 85 schools at 50 percent, and 90 schools at 40 percent.

Florida

Chapter 1 Participation and Funding Summary

Participation Levels in School Year (SY) 1990-1991

Number of Children Served:	165,405
Percentage of K-12 Children Served:	9%
Number and Percentage of School Districts Receiving Chapter 1 Assistance:	67; 100%
Number and Percentage of Schools Receiving Chapter 1 Assistance:	1,011; 46%

Chapter 1 Services by Grade Span in SY 1990-91:

Preschool	2%
Kindergarten	10%
Grades 1-3	47%
Grades 4-6	32%
Grades 7-12	9%

State Funding Levels by School Year

Formula Grants Allocation SY 1990-91, 1991-92:	$204,201,699; $235,930,167
Formula Grants Allocation SY 1992-93:	$269,201,362
Chapter 1 Per Pupil Expenditure SY 1990-91:	$1,234
Program Improvement Allocation SY 1991-92, 1992-93:	$615,583; $1,052,660

Chapter 1 Program Improvement Summary

Number of Schools in Program Improvement in SY 1991-92

Total Number of Schools in Program Improvement:	356
Percentage of Chapter 1 Schools in Program Improvement:	35%
Number of Schools in Joint Planning:	0

Statewide Minimum Standards for Improvement – A minimum of one normal curve equivalent (NCE) gain in basic skills and improvement of the promotion rate of students by at least 5 percent over a three-year period or achievement of a 96 percent promotion rate.

Chapter 1 Program Improvement

Leveraging Accountability and Higher Performance

The state education agency (SEA) is committed to Chapter 1 program improvement because it supports the philosophy of the Florida School Accountability System as evidenced by the initiative of the Commissioner of Education. The Florida School Accountability System is based on the beliefs that all children can learn and that all schools can improve student performance. The focus of the system is establishing accountability for student results at the school level by providing mechanisms for school-based decision making, planning, training, and implementation, including increased local control over funding. The Accountability System is the framework for procedures and standards for the School Improvement Program. Chapter 1 Program Improvement is an integral part of the overall School Improvement Program.

The Chapter 1 Committee of Practitioners has neither encouraged nor discouraged higher minimum statewide standards either in terms of NCE gains on norm-referenced standardized tests or on the achievement of other desired outcomes. Their input has consistently been to set minimum standards to focus on the most needy schools.

Statewide Technical Assistance

The Florida State Department of Education is encouraging and helping schools establish effective locally determined outcomes in addition to NCE gains on norm-referenced tests by requiring the districts to use the same desired outcome (increased promotion rates), but also allowing them to develop additional ones of their own selection. The SEA has developed a technical assistance paper to aid districts in this development and provides them with results of information collected through the Student Information Data Base. The SEA Regional Offices then review districts' desired outcomes to ensure that they conform with the state minimum requirements. The SEA also answers questions, makes on-site visits, provides workshops, or assist in other activities as requested by the districts.

In order to provide technical assistance to the schools identified for program improvement, the SEA has developed a strategy that allows for the Regional SEA staff to work closely with the local education agency (LEA) and school-based staff in the development and implementation of individual program improvement plans. The assistance provided by the SEA includes: informing the LEAs that certain schools

have been identified for program improvement; making on-site visits, attending and working with school planning committees, telephone assistance, technical assistance papers, a checklist to ensure required elements are included in program improvement plans, dissemination of information concerning effective and innovative programs across the state, assistance to districts in identifying appropriate consultants, and monitoring schools identified for program improvement, as requested.

nation of Chapter 1 program improvement and the Florida school improvement plan touches every aspect of school organization including administration, school staff, curriculum, students, and parents and even extends outside the school to involve the business community. Through this team effort of working closely together, the process of improving programs/schools is accepted in a positive manner and places focus on what is best for children.

Not only are students at Midway surpassing the gains made by other Chapter 1 students, but school staff and parents voice overwhelming satisfaction with the changes made in both the school and community.

The SEA staff members make every effort to reduce the negative reaction at the local level accompanying the identification of schools for program improvement. They speak positively of using program improvement as a tool to review, revise, and improve current Chapter 1 programs and to encourage districts to relate it to Florida's mandated school improvement effort. As a result of action by the 1991 Legislature, the School Improvement Partnership Program (SIP) - Assisting Change in Florida Schools, requires all Florida schools to participate in the development of a school needs assessment, and to plan, develop, and implement a school improvement plan to meet the state goals. SEA staff plans with the LEA coordinators to explain the program improvement requirements and meets with school program improvement committees, directors of elementary education, district superintendents, principals, and Chapter 1 program staff to provide technical assistance regarding implementation and development of program improvement/school plans. The coordi-

Successful Models

In an effort to increase program emphasis on the development of advanced skills and the adoption of successful models by identified schools, data are collected and aggregated by the SEA through its Information Data Base. Results of individual students showing no gains are collected by schools and distributed to districts. Aggregated results are analyzed and compared by respective instructional models and disseminated to districts for their review.

The models for curriculum and instructional strategies that are being used with program improvement include: Reading Recovery, cooperative learning, whole language, computer-assisted instruction, increased interest in schoolwide projects, students served on a more frequent basis, reading committees meeting to discuss concerns of students in program improvement, expanded parent involvement plans, and more manipulatives in math. Some school districts have changed instructional models. Coordination with the regular program is evidenced by the Chapter 1 program improvement plan being a part of the school improvement plan and Chapter 1 personnel serving on the school improvement team.

Exiting Program Improvement

In Florida, 4 percent of the schools identified for Chapter 1 program improvement based on the 1989-90 testing cycle tested out of program improvement before their plans were fully implemented. To a great extent, these schools tested out of program improvement because of the development of and at least partial implementation of their program improvement plans. In these instances, the gains are attributed to the campaigns waged by school committees to make teachers, parents, and students aware of the situation. This awareness caused parents and teachers to raise their expectations of students who then applied themselves more diligently.

The SEA, through one-on-one consultation, is encouraging schools that exit program improvement before fully implementing their plans to continue in the program improvement process even though these schools are not required to do so. The schools that are eligible and receive program improvement funds but test out of program improvement are entitled to utilize their allocations if program improvement school plans are fully implemented.

SEA/LEA Joint Plans

The SEA, with the LEAs, is currently identifying schools that will be required to develop and implement joint plans. There were no schools implementing joint plans in Florida as of January, 1992. However, a format for developing joint plans has been provided by the SEA. The first year for implementation of joint program plans will be the 1992-93 school year. When the joint plans are implemented, the SEA will closely analyze the results of the plans with special attention being directed to any unique attributes that are designed to increase achievement. Chapter 1 administrative funds will support this activity. Program improvement funds will be targeted to these schools.

Funding for Program Improvement

All of the 1990-91 program improvement funds are currently being used for mini-grants to LEAs. The SEA estimates that 30 percent of state Chapter 1 administration staff time is devoted to responsibilities for program improvement, which represents all of the statewide technical assistance for program improvement.

There have been some cutbacks in Chapter 1 administrative activities as the result of increased attention to program improvement. These cuts include direct technical assistance visits regarding other areas and attention to curriculum issues/strategies to enhance advanced skills. Often deadlines are missed due to the amount of time needed to collect and verify data, prepare reports, and provide technical assistance regarding school plans and applications for program improvement funds.

The SEA monitors each school district to determine that it is meeting all of the Chapter 1 program improvement requirements. In addition, the monitoring reports are disseminated to each regional SEA office. The results of the reports are included in regional plans for providing technical assistance.

Increasing Capacity for School Improvement

The SEA has assumed responsibility in accordance with federal requirements for technical assistance in establishing outcome goals, LEA compliance with program improvement requirements, testing, evaluation, and the development of joint LEA/SEA plans. Simply tracking schools and projects in and out of required program improvement over a three-year period has placed a major burden on staff. For the SEA to actively participate in the development and implementation of joint plans in a meaningful manner will require additional resources not currently available to the SEA. With no additional Chapter 1 administrative funds, restrictions on the use of program improvement funds and significantly increased responsibilities on SEA staff created through P.L. 100-297, it is virtually impossible to provide technical assistance to the degree necessary to each school requiring program improvement. With significant additional funds, the SEA would provide more on-site technical assistance at the school level in all phases of program improvement, with special emphasis on plan development and integration. Consultants and specialists could be hired on a needs basis to provide direct services in program design, curriculum, student assessment, and team building in an Effective Schools context.

Additional Chapter 1 Innovation and Reform

Schoolwide Projects

Number of schoolwide projects in Florida by school year:

1989-90	85
1990-91	113
1991-92	133

There were 180 schools in the state that were eligible for Chapter 1 schoolwide projects in the 1990-91 school year.

The SEA, in an effort to encourage the development and implementation of schoolwide projects, provides technical assistance with special attention given to determine if a school is eligible. If even one school in a district is eligible, the schoolwide program concept is carefully and specifically explained and assistance is offered by the SEA regional office staff for planning and implementation. LEA coordinators are encouraged to visit and study some of the exemplary existing schoolwide programs. The SEA also coordinates conferences such as the Congress for Educating At-Risk Youth, in an effort to provide information on the latest innovations in Chapter 1 programs. In addition, technical assistance is provided through the Technical Assistance Center for individual schools and districts interested in schoolwide projects. A schoolwide awareness and implementation workshop was held in Florida in cooperation with the United States Department of Education to provide technical assistance, answer questions, and share successful schoolwide programs.

The Regional SEA staff members are very active in providing technical assistance to schools implementing schoolwide projects. In most cases, SEA staff members attend and are considered an integral part of the planning committee for such projects. The staff provides planning tools for plan development and technical assistance, and arranges opportunities for LEA coordinators to share successful strategies. SEA staff provides in-service on needs assessment, evaluation, activities, and data gathering for project continuation after three years of implementation.

The SEA has observed some changes in curriculum, instructional, and organizational techniques in Florida schools that have undertaken schoolwide projects. These changes have almost excluded the use of traditional delivery models with a greater emphasis being placed on tutorial assistance. Most schoolwide projects feature a reduction in pupil-teacher ratios, programs that emphasize the importance of self-esteem, computer-assisted-instruction, and a greater effort to determine and meet individual student needs. These schoolwide projects quite often engage varying degrees of team teaching with intensive teacher training programs provided for the teaching staff.

The SEA has provided a technical assistance paper designed to assist Florida school districts in planning and implementation of a schoolwide project. However, no criteria beyond what is required in the statute and regulations have been added.

There are no schools in Florida with schoolwide projects that have become ineligible because of the maintenance-of-effort requirement. However, some schools implementing schoolwide projects are almost forced to expend state and local funds unnecessarily for instructional purposes to meet the maintenance-of-effort requirements for schoolwide projects.

The SEA estimates that about 25-30 percent of the schoolwide projects will have problems meeting the performance

improvement requirements of the law.

The SEA makes the following estimates of the number of schools that would be eligible for schoolwide projects if the low-income eligibility thresholds were reduced from 75 percent to the following levels: 269 schools at 60 percent, 371 schools at 50 percent, and 509 schools at 40 percent.

Coordination with the Regular Classroom

All schools in Florida are in the process of developing school improvement plans in connection with the State Education Commissioner's "Blue Print 2000" initiative for school accountability. The SEA central office and regional staff are assisting the LEAs in the coordination of Chapter 1 services with school improvement plans to ensure Chapter 1 success as part of the school program. The rotating teacher concept has been approved by the SEA and is currently being implemented in some districts to help coordinate services with regular classroom teachers. The SEA promotes the delivery of Chapter 1 services in the regular classroom by placing emphasis on meaningful coordination with the regular classroom teacher. Area staff members are continually observing the subjective qualities of this approach.

In an effort to help regular classroom and Chapter 1 teachers to better teach Chapter 1 students, the SEA has developed and sponsored various in-service programs such as training for Chapter 1 teachers to help expand services to limited-English-proficient (LEP) students. The SEA is active in conducting and promoting workshops and conferences that provide valuable sessions on educating Chapter 1 students. In addition to these workshops and conferences, the SEA is active in both publishing and disseminating up-to-date strategies on educating students.

Statewide Coordination

All schools in Florida are in the process of developing school improvement plans in conjunction with the state's initiative for school accountability. In many cases, the Chapter 1 programs are serving as the framework for this statewide effort. School improvement teams that include Chapter 1 representation and a trained SEA facilitator work cooperatively to plan and develop a school plan that meets the requirements of Chapter 1; facilitate better learning for all students; improve student performance/productivity, outcomes, and attitudes to make every kid a winner every day. This ongoing, coordinated, systematic process of school improvement promotes greater satisfaction for all involved.

The Florida State Compensatory Education program was placed in abeyance in 1991, after receiving categorical dollars each year since 1977. However, statutory provision was also made in 1991 to serve these educationally disadvantaged students in dropout prevention programs in a remedial compensatory model. The program is coordinated with Chapter 1 to the extent that remediation for educationally disadvantaged students must occur in basic, Chapter 1, or dropout prevention programs. The application for funds is not consolidated with the Chapter 1 application, but administrative responsibility for both programs rests in the same bureau, thus ensuring coordination and a cohesion of thrust.

In an effort to streamline the administrative and paperwork requirements at the local level, the SEA continues to: make data available to the LEA through the Florida State Department of Education Information Data Base; hold meetings with the LEA coordinators to explain the program improvement requirements and help expedite the process; provide the LEA with a checklist to ensure that required elements are included in the program improvement plans; implement bureau-based management; reduce application/evaluation pages via electronic transmissions; and make staff available to answer questions, make on-site visits, or provide technical assistance in activities, as requested by the LEAs.

The SEA encourages the use of Chapter 1 funds for preschool programs and currently provides services to three- and four-year old children in nine districts. Additionally, migrant educational services are provided through federal and state funds to preschool children in twenty-eight districts and four agencies. Statewide coordination is accomplished through the participation of the SEA in a State Coordination Council for Early Childhood Services. The Department of Education's Office of Early Intervention and School Readiness and Chapter 1 work closely together with Head Start, Health and Rehabilitative Services, Even Start, South Eastern Regional Vision for Education (Project SERVE), and other initiatives that provide services for disadvantaged children.

Technical assistance is provided statewide to assist districts in coordination of efforts regarding available program services, funding, resources, and appropriate curriculum. In the recent reorganization of the Department of Education, the Office of Early Intervention and School Readiness became responsible for coordination of all preschool programs statewide. In an effort to ensure that Chapter 1 services to eligible basic and migrant students are provided and continued, a Chapter 1 funded position has been recommended to provide technical assistance and coordinate Even Start and district Chapter 1 preschool programs.

State technical assistance papers, have been developed and disseminated to encourage cooperative planning and implementation of various programs including Chapter 1, migrant education, bilingual education, and special education.

LEP students must be selected for Chapter 1 services on an equitable basis and may not be selected simply because they are limited in their English ability. There must be some clear indication that they are also educationally disadvantaged. Perhaps the simplest way would be to select on the basis of a standardized reading or other basic skills test in the native language. This is not always practical, however, so other mea-

sures and indicators may be used. Such other measures and indicators include informal assessments, observation by school staff, records of academic performance, and other relevant individualized indicators of educational deprivation. Chapter 1 and bilingual/English-as-a-second-language staff have worked collaboratively to address issues facing disadvantaged LEP children who qualify for both types of services.

In addition to an ongoing dialogue on how to ensure and improve programs and services, the staff of both programs make a constant effort to provide technical assistance to district personnel in handling issues of disadvantaged LEP children. This effort has been made collaboratively through technical assistance meetings, papers, and direct service to districts. The Multi-Cultural Education Training and Advocacy, Inc. (META) negotiated agreement was filed in court as a consent decree in August 1990. The agreement requires equal access to appropriate programs for LEP students. All activities designed to meet the terms of the agreement are a collaborative effort of the staff of Chapter 1 and bilingual education with other SEA representation.

Each district is required to address the special needs of children with mild disabilities as part of the staffing and development of the Individualized Educational Plan (IEP) for special education programs. For all children in this category who meet Chapter 1 eligibility and selection requirements, a determination of whether the child's needs can be helped through the Chapter 1 Program is a required element of the staffing and development of the IEP. As children are mainstreamed into the least restrictive environment, Chapter 1 programs, particularly replacement models, are often an intermediate step to full mainstreaming. All children, regardless of handicapping condition, are provided access to the Chapter 1 programs if they meet eligibility and selection criteria unless there is documented evidence that the child's needs are being met through other, non-federal funding sources.

Making A Difference School by School

Schoolwide Project at Midway Elementary School, Sanford

The schoolwide project at Midway Elementary School was planned to address a variety of needs stemming from the area's increasing economic deprivation. The Midway area was one of the county's highest crime and drug-use areas, surrounded by a rapidly growing and increasingly suburban county. LEA staff decided to use the schoolwide project as a means of identifying and addressing the specific educational needs of the area's children and their parents, while making the Midway campus a safe haven for school- and community-based activities. Toward that end, Chapter 1 staff coordinated efforts with other LEA resources, local law enforcement agencies, Seminole Community College, and other civic leaders. The result has been a dramatic turnaround in the school, the impact of which has been felt throughout the community.

Specifically, Chapter 1 funds were used to: lower the pupil-teacher ratio (averaging18:1 in grades K-3; 20:1 in grades 4-5); provide computer-assisted-instruction (CAI) for all students in grades 1-4; hire full-time teachers for physical education, art, music and a full-time Chapter 1 resource teacher for the school; and provide field trips and other enrichment activities. Close coordination with other funding sources allowed the school to offer a broad range of evening activities, including literacy and adult basic education classes, training for the take-home computer program, and an outreach library. All of these efforts were aimed at improving parents' awareness of the importance of education for their children and increasing their ability to become active participants in the educational process.

This project is now in its third year of implementation, and test results, along with other measures, indicate remarkable success. Not only are students at Midway surpassing the gains made by other Chapter 1 students, but school staff and parents voice overwhelming satisfaction with the changes made in both the school and community.

Program Improvement at Apalachee Elementary School, Tallahassee

Apalachee Elementary School designed a program improvement plan in mathematics for grades 2 and 3. The emphasis was placed on an increased use of manipulatives; intensified practice on computation; expanded parental involvement activities, adopting "Partners for Excellence"; promotion of test preparedness and test-taking skills; a modified instructional delivery model in grade 2 to a three-day in-class/two day pull-out; increased the time allotted to mathematics instruction; and use of a computer resource room. Another aspect of the plan was to use the district-level mathematics resource teacher to assist the teacher(s) responsible for the program improvement plan.

During the implementation of the plan, new student achievement data demonstrated gains in aggregate performance, which raised the school's level of achievement above the cut-off for program improvement. The Leon County Chapter 1 Director attributes these gains to the higher expectations of teachers and parents and more diligent work of the students.

Georgia

Chapter 1 Participation and Funding Summary

Participation Levels in School Year (SY) 1990-91

Number of Children Served:	142,446
Percentage of K-12 Children Served:	12%
Number and Percentage of School Districts Receiving Chapter 1 Assistance:	184; 100%
Number and Percentage of Schools Receiving Chapter 1 Assistance:	1,078; 62%

Chapter 1 Services by Grade Span SY 1990-91:

Preschool	<1%
Kindergarten	<1%
Grades 1-3	35%
Grades 4-6	43%
Grades 7-12	22%

State Funding Levels by School Year

Formula Grants Allocation SY 1990-91, 1991-92 :	$130,481,354; $160,691,129
Formula Grants Allocation SY 1992-93:	$180,202,186
Chapter 1 Per Pupil Expenditure SY 1990-91:	$783
Program Improvement Allocation 1991-92, 1992-93:	$ 385,795; $655,462

Chapter 1 Program Improvement Summary

Number of Schools in Program Improvement SY 1991-92

Total Number of Schools in Program Improvement:	254
Percentage of Chapter 1 Schools in Program Improvement:	25%
Number of Schools in Joint Planning:	12

Statewide Minimum Standards for Improvement -A normal curve equivalent (NCE) gain greater than zero in basic and advanced skills and success meeting locally determined desired outcomes.

Chapter 1 Program Improvement

Leveraging Accountability and Higher Performance

According to a survey of schools identified for program improvement, the program improvement process has had a very positive effect on local school programs by requiring the identified schools to evaluate and improve their programs. School committees developed for program improvement have given both Chapter 1 and regular classroom teachers a greater voice in program planning and have moved planning away from the central office and into the school. These changes have encouraged a school-based team of professionals to work together toward common goals and have discouraged separation of programs.

Although there are some problems and inconsistencies with the use of norm-referenced tests (NRTs) and the NCE, other more viable evaluation procedures have not been found. Experience with local education agency (LEA)-established desired outcomes for program evaluation indicates that they alone would fail to improve programs. Until more practical and valid evaluation procedures are developed, the use of aggregate scores and desired outcomes provides the best hope for evaluating the various components of the program.

Strong quality control at the SEA and emphasis on quality testing programs increase the quality of evaluation using NRTs. Local administrators are trained on the proper interpretation of test scores, and test results are viewed as program quality indicators which must be paired with other evaluation measures. In order to avoid manipulation and misunderstanding of test results, Chapter 1 evaluation results for each system are not used to compare systems at the state level. Results are used locally for program evaluation and improvement.

Few low-performing schools are missed in the program improvement process. In a recent survey of fifty-two LEAs, only nineteen percent of the respondents believed that they had low-performing schools that had not been identified for program improvement.

Statewide Technical Assistance

As a first step, the SEA assists LEAs in establishing effective desired outcomes through the instructions for the local application, evaluation workshops in the fall and spring, and regional workshops.

Once schools are identified for program improvement, the state education agency (SEA) provides assistance in developing and implementing a program improvement plan. At regional workshops sponsored by the Technical Assistance Center (TAC), school committees analyze testing data as well as local program and curriculum components and formulate program improvement activities. Area consultants have provided individualized and regional workshops for school improvement committees and

LEA administrators. Additional training has been provided to increase parents' involvement in the academic growth of their children. The SEA also plans to increase the involvement of classroom teachers in the planning and implementation of Chapter 1 programs. A state Chapter 1 newsletter will focus on teachers as the most valuable school resource, and discussions are underway for a teacher conference during the summer. The conference will address techniques for teaching advanced skills as well as curriculum and instructional strategies that work with educationally deprived children.

Through regional workshops within the state and extensive work with individual schools and districts, the state has countered the negative stigma of program improvement by stressing the importance of continued growth and improvement. There has also been increased emphasis on the potential beneficial and supportive capabilities that program improvement funding could provide a school to improve its instructional program. The results of these efforts were reflected in the increased number of schools that applied for program improvement funding in FY92.

Successful Models

Throughout Georgia's Chapter 1 program improvement schools, various instructional strategies and curriculum models being used include Reading Recovery, Math Their Way, Kuman Math, whole language, integrated language arts, computer assisted instruction, and Higher Order Thinking Skills (HOTS). In-class scheduling, joint staff development, and team consultations are being used to improve coordination with regular programs.

Exiting Program Improvement

Based on the 1989-90 evaluation, 195 (18%) of the Chapter 1 schools were identified for program improvement. Of these, 140 (72%) tested out before full implementation of their plans. It is estimated that 80 percent of those tested out because they improved their program during the 1990-91 school year. In a recent survey of thirty LEAs with schools in program improvement, twenty-five respondents (83%) believed that the programs improved as a result of the process.

The SEA encourages school systems to fully implement all improvements during the planning year. If a school tests out at the end of the first year, it is encouraged to continue the program improvement process even though it is not formally identified.

Joint SEA/LEA Plans

The process for joint planning focuses on the role of area consultants as facilitators in the program improvement process. The consultants work as a resource to the local school improvement committee. They attend the meetings, stimulate discussion, suggest improvements, and provide resources upon request. The state provides technical assistance through regional and local workshops and individual contact with LEA staff. The state supports joint improvement activities through program improvement funds distributed on a competitive basis. The state plans to give first priority for program improvement funds to schools in joint program improvement.

Funding for Program Improvement

As of February 1992, all of the 1990-91 and 1991-92 program improvement funds had been distributed in mini-grants to LEAs. Additionally, approximately 65 percent of state administration staff time is devoted to Chapter 1 program improvement. All of the state technical assistance in program improvement is supported by state administrative funds. In order to conduct program improvement activities, the state staff has significantly cut monitoring activities. Much more time is spent on increasing parental activities, improving instruction, tracking schools in program improvement, awarding program improvement grants, planning joint program improvement, and restructuring education through schoolwide projects.

Efforts are being made to coordinate Chapter 1 monitoring and compliance requirements with Chapter 1 program improvement goals. For many years, 75 percent or more of the LEAs have been annually monitored through on-site visits. In the past two years, monitoring activities have been on a more informal basis. Area consultants are checking various compliance issues through the pre-application review, on-site visits for technical assistance, the approval of applications, and the review of LEA reports submitted to the state (i.e., comparability reports). The staff is developing a document that will be maintained by area consultants who will review compliance informally as described above.

Increasing Capacity for School Improvement

The state needs additional resources to increase SEA program improvement capacity and provide technical assistance for the establishment of outcome goals, testing, statewide performance data management, and joint SEA/LEA projects. The need for computerized data management at the local level has been greatly increased because of the requirement for annual evaluation, desired outcomes, individual student and local school program improvement, evaluation of progress in the regular classroom, and schoolwide project evaluation. Currently, approximately 123 (67%) of the LEAs in Georgia are conducting written evaluations of their Chapter 1 programs. Additional state funds would allow the state either to develop programs for local use or support SEA programs to aggregate data for LEAs.

The skills necessary for stimulating and facilitating program improvement are quite different from the skills necessary for compliance monitoring, which was the previous Chapter 1 focus. Additional state funds would provide new staff and/or staff development for existing staff. Additional funds would also provide the necessary resources for train-

ing LEA staff from program improvement schools and hiring consultants to work with specific schools.

Additional Chapter 1 Innovation and Reform

Schoolwide Projects

Number of schoolwide projects in Georgia by school year:

1989-90:	3
1990-91:	28
1991-92:	37

In the 1990-91 school year there were 110 schools eligible for schoolwide projects.

Schoolwide projects have enabled schools to make curriculum, instructional and organizational changes that include: computer networking; early childhood intervention (in programs for four-year-olds); diversified materials; lowered pupil-teacher ratios; increased parent involvement; in-school day care centers for students; attendance clerks; leading edge instruction in reading and math; additional school/central office staff with specific responsibilities for improving teaching styles; expanded opportunities for field trips; and cooperative planning with family service agencies to help at-risk students and their families obtain needed assistance with health care, family literacy, career guidance, and housing.

The SEA is working individually with eligible schools to encourage them to consider the schoolwide project option. School districts are encouraged to reduce the number of schools served by Chapter 1 funds to increase the funding to schoolwide project schools. School districts are also encouraged to spend at least one year planning the restructuring of schools that intend to have schoolwide projects.

Workshops using state and TAC staff have been provided to schools interested in schoolwide projects. Personnel from the Rural Technical Assistance Centers (RTAC) and TAC have worked with individual schools. Area consultants have provided guidance to the LEAs.

The SEA makes the following projections of the number of schools in the state that would be eligible for schoolwide projects if the low-income eligibility threshold were reduced from 75 percent to the following levels: 243 schools at 60 percent, 408 schools at 50 percent, and 579 schools at 40 percent.

Coordination with the Regular Classroom

Parallel and in-class scheduling, joint staff development, and team consultation are used to improve coordination with regular programs. When LEAs are encouraged to carefully review and select the appropriate models to provide Chapter 1 services, particular attention is given to the in-class model. Regardless of the model selected, the state's staff continuously emphasizes the importance of coordination of services. Efforts to improve coordination include semi-annual workshops, meetings with individual LEA coordinators and other school personnel, written communication with LEA staff, and scheduling of planning time for Chapter 1 teachers to work with regular classroom teachers.

Statewide efforts in teacher preparation or in-service training to help Chapter 1 and regular classroom teachers teach Chapter 1 children better in the regular classroom include suggestions and encouragement from the SEA staff for LEAs to carefully assess and plan staff development activities for the specific needs of Chapter 1 personnel. Staff development activities are included in the LEA application process. LEAs are further encouraged to include regular classroom teachers in staff development and in-service training activities that facilitate more effective teaching of Chapter 1 children. The SEA staff holds workshops that present strategies to improve communication between Chapter 1 instructional staff and classroom teachers, demonstrate how Chapter 1 curriculum should support the regular classroom curriculum, help classroom teachers understand the purpose and scope of Chapter 1 supplemental instruction, and promote coordinated planning for the delivery of instructional services to meet students' needs.

Statewide Coordination

Georgia has a state compensatory education program, the Remedial Education Program (REP), which is coordinated with the Chapter 1 program. REP is administered separately, but is in the same administrative unit as the Chapter 1 program. REP provides the "basic" program for identified students; the Chapter 1 program is supplemental. Students may be served by both programs. The evaluation procedures for REP in the elementary grades use the Chapter 1 model for desired outcomes. In an effort to coordinate these programs, joint delivery models have been developed that meet the program requirements of both programs. Program applications are separate. The state also operates a Special Instructional Assistance (SIA) program for at-risk students in grades K-3. The SIA provides basic instruction and uses a developmental approach for instruction and curriculum development. Students may participate in SIA and receive supplemental instruction from the Chapter 1 program.

Current activities to coordinate Chapter 1 with Head Start and local preschool programs are conducted at the

... the program improvement process has had a very positive effect on local school programs by forcing the identified schools to evaluate their programs and improve them.

local level. Pre-kindergarten programs provided through Chapter 1 have strong planning and coordination activities to ensure the most effective use of funds to meet the needs of children.

Guidance about how to coordinate Chapter 1, state compensatory education, special education, and bilingual education funds is provided by area consultants in regional workshops and during individualized technical assistance. The state compensatory program, Chapter 1 program, and bilingual programs are in the same unit within the SEA. Often programs are administered at the local level by the same person.

The SEA is taking actions to streamline the administrative requirements at the local level. The project application has been revised and reduced for the 1992-93 school year. The program improvement plan format is being revised and reduced. The capital expense application has been revised.

Educationally deprived LEP children are eligible for Chapter 1 services and must be considered in the LEAs' needs assessment. Categorical "skipping" or excluding LEP children from Chapter 1 is not sanctioned. LEP children are selected using the same criteria as non-LEP children when possible. The state recommends multiple criteria with a standardized test in the native language or one administered by a speaker of the native language. When objective measures in the native language are not available and accurate data from English measures are not possible, LEAs should use multiple criteria such as teacher rating of deprivation, selected items from Language Assessment Battery, student support team recommendations, and data from LEP or English to Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) files. Collaborative efforts undertaken between Chapter 1 staff and bilingual/LEP staff to address issues facing disadvantaged LEP children qualifying for both services include joint planning and staff development.

In Georgia, all students having difficulty in the regular program must be referred to the school's "student support team" (SST) before they are referred for special education. The SST is composed of regular, special education, and Chapter 1 teachers as well as counselors and school psychologists. The purposes of the SST are to evaluate the individual needs of the student and to provide support and services to meet those needs. Referral to special education may or may not result from the SST. Through participation in the SST, Chapter 1 teachers become an integral part of the educational team and become an important link between regular and special education.

Other efforts to coordinate Chapter 1 with special education to address the high percentage of children served by special education who have mild disabilities with characteristics similar to Chapter 1 children occur primarily through workshops with LEA coordinators. LEAs are reminded, via the Chapter 1 policy manual, that special education children may be served by the Chapter 1 program if selected on the same basis as other participants. Special educational services, listed in the Individualized Education Plan (IEP), may not be provided with Chapter 1 funds. LEAs are also reminded that coordination with the regular and special education program is not just required but of paramount importance.

Making a Difference School by School

Schoolwide Project at Muscogee County Elementary School, Columbus

The Muscogee Elementary School serves 450 (K-5) neighborhood children, 88 percent of whom are black and 97 percent of whom are low-income. It is currently implementing the second year of its three-year schoolwide plan. With assistance and support from the SEA, TAC, and LEA Chapter 1 staff, Muscogee Elementary School developed its three-year schoolwide plan during the 1989-90 school year to address needs identified in its comprehensive needs assessment. Project goals, objectives, and activities were designed to increase achievement, abate discipline problems, address the problems concomitant with a highly mobile student population, reduce failure/retention rates, increase parental participation, improve student self-esteem and faculty morale, and create an overall school climate that fosters learning. Project activities, based on Effective Schools research, were constructed to revitalize and restructure the entire school.

Pre-implementation staff development for teachers, staff, and administration included training in whole language, thematic lessons, cooperative learning, application of NCTM standards, parent-teacher relationships, classroom management, parallel-block scheduling,and integrating computer-assisted instruction (CAI) into the instructional program. Parent training included workshops on school volunteering, home discipline, home teaching, and adult literacy.

The instructional program was completely restructured to assimilate findings from research and to use skills acquired during staff development. Class sizes were reduced and instructional time was doubled for reading and mathematics in grades 2-5 through parallel-block scheduling and extension teachers. Half of the students in a regular class at these grades received a full period of instruction from their regular teacher in basic reading or mathematics, while the remaining half received instruction in the same subject with their extension teacher. At the end of a class period, the regular and extension teachers exchanged children. Extension classes focused on creative applications through a state-funded special assistance program. All K-5 children received additional instruction daily in reading and mathematics through an integrated learning computer lab. Other subjects were taught within the context of the current theme.

Thematic lessons required joint planning by teachers. Time for daily planning for grade-group teachers was provided by a release-time teacher who taught physical education classes for all teachers. The release-time teacher incorporated team building, conflict resolution, and other positive interaction strategies into lessons to train students in self-control, build trust among peers, improve students' self-esteem, and develop appropriate strategies for resolving conflicts.

Other activities to improve student motivation and self-esteem included a wide array of schoolwide celebrations and awards for a myriad of student achievements, such as weekly gains in CAI, no failing grades during a grading period, and good citizenship. Classes were recognized for exemplary group behavior during CAI, physical education, art and music classes, or for having the largest number of parents participating in a schoolwide activity (meeting, parent/student lunch day, listen-to-your-child-read day, etc.). The school's business partner provided incentives, refreshments, awards, and personnel for these events.

At the end of the first year (1990-91), the percentage of students scoring in the upper stanines on the norm-referenced achievement test increased by 23 percent in mathematics and 18 percent in reading over the scores from 1990. Similarly, 22 percent fewer scored in the lower stanines in mathematics and 32 percent fewer in reading for the same period. Forty-five percent more children had no failing grades on their last report cards. The number of children retained dropped from seventy-three in 1990 to fourteen in 1991. Disciplinary referrals dropped by 67 percent, and Muscogee Elementary children won their area's 1991 Mathematics Tournament for the first time in the history of the school. A total of 254 parents provided volunteer service at the school during the 1990-91 school year and 51 parents enrolled in after-school GED classes in the computer lab.

Program Improvement at Claxton Elementary School, Evans County

Claxton Elementary has made a difference for children through the involvement of school personnel and the community in the school's program improvement efforts. The program improvement plan was designed to improve parental interest and participation in the academic process and increase student interest in academics. The program improvement plan included meetings with parents to teach them about the program, provide an analysis of their student's strengths and weaknesses, and teach specific skills they could use to instruct their child at home. The plan also aimed to increase CAI results, and establish a system of awards to recognize individual student achievement.

As a result of full implementation of the plan, the school's reading program improved from an NCE loss of -9.2 to a gain of 1.75 in two years. The math program increased from an NCE loss of -7.6 to a gain of 3.47 in the same two-year period. As parental interest and the resulting student motivation increased, student efforts provided more opportunities for success and recognition. This helped students to develop more positive self-images and take advantage of greater learning opportunities.

Hawaii

Chapter 1 Participation and Funding Summary

Participation Levels in School Year (SY) 1990-91

Number of Children Receiving Assistance:	14,607
Percentage of K-12 Children Served:	9%
Number and Percentage of School Districts Receiving Chapter 1 Assistance:	7; 100%
Number and Percentage of Schools Receiving Chapter 1 Assistance:	103; 37%

Chapter 1 Services by Grade Span in SY 1990-91

Preschool	0%
Kindergarten	0%
Grades 1-3	33%
Grades 4-6	42%
Grades 7-12	25%

State Funding Levels by School Year

Formula Grants Allocation SY 1990-91, 1991-92:	$13,984,816; $15,640,354
Formula Grants Allocation SY 1992-93:	$17,233,800
Chapter 1 Per Pupil Expenditure SY 1990-91:	$1,071
Program Improvement Allocation SY 1991-92, 1992-93:	$90,000; $180,000

Chapter 1 Program Improvement Summary

Number of Schools in Program Improvement in SY 1991-92

Total Number of Schools in Program Improvement:	56
Percentage of Chapter 1 Schools in Program Improvement:	64%
Number of Schools in Joint Planning:	26

Statewide Minimum Standards for Improvement—A normal curve equivalent (NCE) gain greater than zero in basic and advanced skills and achievement of locally determined desired outcomes.

Chapter 1 Program Improvement

Leveraging Accountability and Higher Performance

Program improvement is an essential component of Chapter 1 because it encourages the establishment of high expectations and supports raising achievement levels based on the assessment of student performance. Furthermore, it is important because some funding in support of change is provided when appropriate. In Hawaii it has helped to focus on the national goals, which had not previously happened, and has provided opportunities for better communication and coordination.

Six of the seven school districts in Hawaii have set higher minimum standards and/or percentages of students who must make substantial progress, which has been interpreted as 60 percent of the targeted students achieving locally determined desired outcomes.

Raising the minimum standard will be discussed at the next Committee of Practitioners (COP) meeting in the summer of 1992. The COP is cautious due to the lack of a "track record" or other evidence of setting and meeting realistic, achievable standards. All schools identified for program improvement have been identified by both aggregate achievement and desired outcomes criteria.

Statewide Technical Assistance

The state education agency (SEA) encourages schools to develop effective locally determined desired outcomes in addition to NCE standards through staff development workshops at both the district and individual school levels, individualized consultant services from SEA staff and Technical Assistance Center/Rural Technical Assistance Center (TAC/RTAC) staff, and a review of district and school program improvement plans before formal submittal in order to allow for suggestions and recommendations.

Once a school is identified for program improvement, local education agency (LEA) staff and school personnel participate in state-initiated workshops focused on improving coordination and instruction. The state Chapter 1 administrator has shared recent research and successful models with all district coordinators at their meetings to increase development of advanced skills and adoption of successful models. Periodic memoranda and notes are sent to update district coordinators on technical assistance services available from TAC/RTAC as well as SEA staff (e.g., consultant services and organized workshops). Workshop series have been conducted within the past two years on advanced skills and successful models.

To reduce any potential negative association with identification for program improvement, SEA staff members continuously focus on program improvement as the driving force that will make

the difference in Chapter 1 students' success. SEA staff gives priority to responding to requests for assistance related to program improvement. Furthermore, all Chapter 1 meetings with district- and school-level personnel involve discussion of program improvement with the intent that more clarity and understanding will generate more positive acceptance.

Successful Models

Program improvement activities include extended (after) school sessions for selected Chapter 1 students and arrangements for coordination/planning time for Chapter 1 and regular teachers during the regular school day. More teachers are opting for an intervention model, as opposed to a pull-out model, for delivery of Chapter 1 services. There is more commitment and recognition of the need to do a thorough analysis of assessment and evaluation data to support instructional activities, and more effort to improve communication between Chapter 1 and regular teachers and the school and parents of Chapter 1 children.

Exiting Program Improvement

Twelve schools, representing 24 percent of those identified for program improvement based on the 1989-90 testing cycle, tested out before their plans were fully implemented. Evidence suggests that some of these schools tested out due to an aberration in test scores. The SEA encourages schools that exit program improvement before implementation of plans to incorporate their program improvement plans into their project applications.

Joint SEA/LEA Plans

Districts identify schools for "joint planning" and plan for extended meeting(s) with the assessment team, including SEA staff. Agreements are made on immediate and long-term plans, strategies, and activities that specifically focus on areas determined during the joint planning session that require action. Schools prepare a written "joint plan," which is submitted to the district; copies are sent to the SEA. If the plan requires additional funding, it is requested on a form to the SEA.

In every joint planning session, the pros and cons of intervention and pull-out models for Chapter 1 are discussed. SEA staff carefully guide the assessment teams to consider which models will benefit the students at the particular school and provide as much supporting data as necessary. Coordination of services is a major topic of discussion.

SEA staff members provide leadership in the joint planning sessions and arrange for review of joint planning funding requests for those that require additional funds. Thus far, there has been a positive response from school-level Chapter 1 personnel (teachers, principals, and parents). Initiatives for improvement activities are focused and commitment is made to follow a timeline.

Funding for Program Improvement

Program improvement funds are earmarked for specific cost items, such as specific book titles for a Chapter 1 lending library; and part-time personnel for a summer school Chapter 1 program.

Approximately 40 percent of SEA Chapter 1 time is devoted to program improvement. All of state technical assistance is supported by state administrative funds. No administrative activities have been cut back as the result of increased attention to program improvement.

The Chapter 1 monitoring and compliance requirements now include review of the program improvement objectives and activities of schools.

Increasing Capacity for School Improvement

Although significant efforts have been initiated with current resources, with additional program improvement funds, research-based, break-the-mold strategies and programs can be tried at selected schools. Bold, innovative programs/strategies/activities currently require additional staffing, time for planning, and occasionally new equipment and resource materials that cannot be accommodated with the state's meager $90,000 program improvement funding.

More teachers are opting for an intervention model, as opposed to a pull-out model, for delivery of Chapter 1 services.

Additional Chapter 1 Innovation and Reform

Schoolwide Projects

Hawaii does not have any schools eligible for schoolwide projects based on data received from the State Department of Health and Human Services Welfare file.

The following number of schools would be eligible for schoolwide projects if the low-income eligibility threshold were lowered from 75 percent to the following levels: 1 school at 60 percent, 1 school at 50 percent; and 2 schools at 40 percent.

Coordination with the Regular Classroom

The SEA, with assistance from the RTAC, has conducted workshops on Chapter 1 coordination of services with regular education teachers, with both groups and the administrators participating in the sessions. This workshop is frequently suggested as one of the program improvement activities a school should undertake. It is anticipated that more workshops on this topic will be offered.

Statewide Coordination

In Hawaii, key state administrators frequently identify the Chapter 1 program improvement process as a framework appropriate for statewide school improve-

ment. All school districts are currently implementing school improvement activities. Chapter 1 accountability provisions are more stringent than district requirements, but appear to be congruent and therefore contribute to the overall school improvement efforts.

Even Start has provided an important link between Chapter 1 and preschool programs serving disadvantaged students. The SEA encourages the use of Chapter 1 funds for the early primary years (kindergarten and grade 1) through guidance provided in the preapplication form through which districts request approval from the state to proceed to develop their Chapter 1 project plan for the next year.

Guidance on coordinating Chapter 1 with other categorical programs has been primarily at the information dissemination stage. Directions from the national level, both in written and verbal form have been communicated to district-level and other educational personnel in the school system. While the SEA has not developed statewide criteria for selecting limited-English-proficient (LEP) students, districts have developed their respective selection criteria. Coordination between Chapter 1 and special education is undertaken on a case-by-case basis and determinations are made as appropriate.

The SEA is sensitive about any additional paperwork burden and therefore has minimized the number of forms and formats required for accountability and reporting. Where possible, information is collected or consolidated by district staff rather than school personnel.

Making a Difference School by School

Program Improvement at Maili Elementary School, Leeward Oahu District

Maili Elementary School was identified for program improvement during the 1990-91 school year. It is currently in its second year of program improvement.

The Chapter 1 program improvement process has had a positive effect not only for Chapter 1 children but on the entire school. It has greatly enhanced Chapter 1 program leadership, which has made a difference in the quality of services provided for all students. The principal, with the assistance of a curriculum coordinator, was able to establish greater coordination between the regular teachers and Chapter 1 teachers, specifically in the following improvement areas:

- Systematic evaluations of student performance are conducted, using alternative assessment methods. This is now an ongoing process at the school. Each child has a reading portfolio, and student progress is assessed over a period of time;
- The involvement of Chapter 1 parents in their children's learning experiences has been extended with easy access to a lending library of educational materials;
- The school's current mathematics program is being reexamined in view of the new paradigm in math education. Students are now actively engaged in problem-solving tasks using math manipulatives; and
- A testwiseness program that integrates test-taking skills into classroom instruction is being implemented. Grade-level teachers have set ten hours of testwiseness instruction to be implemented.

It is evident that the focus on improvement initiated through the Chapter 1 program improvement plan is providing direction and support for higher student achievement in basic and advanced skills, as well as for the overall quality of educational services provided for all children.

Idaho

Chapter 1 Participation and Funding Summary

Participation Levels in School Year (SY) 1990-91

Number of Children Served:	22,184
Percentage of K-12 Children Served:	10%
Number and Percentage of School Districts Receiving Assistance:	110; 97%
Number and Percentage of Schools Receiving Chapter 1 Assistance:	406; 85%

Chapter 1 Services by Grade Span in SY 1990-91

Preschool	0%
Kindergarten	2%
Grades 1-3	42%
Grades 4-6	33%
Grades 7-12	23%

State Funding Levels by School Year

Formula Grants Allocation SY 1990-91, 1991-92:	$13,784,286; $15,963,264
Formula Grants Allocation SY 1992-93:	$18,016,046
Chapter 1 Per Pupil Expenditure SY 1990-91:	$592
Program Improvement Allocation SY 1991-92, 1992-93:	$90,000; $180,000

Chapter 1 Program Improvement Summary

Number of Schools in Program Improvement in SY 1991-92

Total Number of Schools in Program Improvement:	100
Percentage of Chapter 1 Schools in Program Improvement:	25%
Number of Schools in Joint Planning:	11

Statewide Minimum Standards for Improvement –Greater than zero normal curve equivalent (NCE) gains and progress toward meeting desired outcomes, which must include a measure of success in the regular classroom and a measure for kindergarten and the 1st grade.

Chapter 1 Program Improvement

Leveraging Accountability and Higher Performance

Program improvement forces schools to take a serious look at how successful the school is at meeting the needs of at-risk students. It has leveraged collaborative efforts to improve instruction and school climate. The emphasis is now more on systemic change at the building level. It is forcing schools to look at alternative assessment in setting their desired outcomes.

The Committee of Practitioners (COP) has encouraged higher standards by having local education agencies (LEAs) measure success against their own desired outcomes. Ninety-five percent of all schools identified for program improvement have established achievement objectives that exceed the state minimum standard. The LEA evaluation has been revised to require each district to address locally determined outcomes in completing its annual evaluation.

Statewide Technical Assistance

To encourage schools to establish effective locally determined desired outcomes, models and examples of desired outcomes are provided in the instructions for each project's grant application. Regional and statewide workshop sessions focus on methods of alternative assessment, including portfolio assessments, curriculum-based assessments, and criterion-referenced assessments. Technical Assistance Center (TAC) specialists provide specific on-site and regional support for schools involved in program improvement to assist with monitoring and measuring achievement.

Once schools are identified for improvement, the state education agency (SEA) provides workshops that assist schools in developing improvement plans, address individual plans, and help to establish consortia among LEAs with common objectives and goals. The TAC also conducts follow-up workshops and on-sight visits to identify what's working and provide additional technical assistance as needed. Emphasis on the development of advanced skills and the adoption of successful models is a part of every workshop and school visit.

In Idaho, program improvement and monitoring are complementary in that the same people administer both. Monitoring includes looking at the program improvement effort and the program improvement plan includes recommendations from the monitoring efforts.

In order to reduce the potential negative association at the local level accompanying the identification of schools for program improvement, the SEA has taken care to emphasize the opportunity rather than the punitive aspect of the program. The SEA sponsors special administrators' briefings with presentations

by the COP. It also showcases testimonies of successful program improvement plans, provides support for LEA improvement efforts, and gives LEAs an opportunity to appeal their identification if they have alternative data and evidence that indicates their program is successful.

Successful Models

There is fairly widespread implementation of an early intervention model that incorporates Reading Recovery training for Chapter 1 and special education teachers and Early Literacy In-service Course training for K-3 regular classroom teachers. This combination gives schools a uniform philosophy and approach to teaching language arts and is consistent with the new state integrated language arts guide. Cooperative learning models and collaborative models that use consultation, teacher assistance teams, co-teaching, and peer coaching have also been implemented in several program improvement schools. Some program improvement middle schools are joining forces and funds to launch extensive training in effective middle school models.

Joint SEA/LEA Plans

The Idaho Department of Education has undertaken a number of activities to begin its first year of joint planning. SEA staff team up with TAC representatives and visit each school. At the site, the teams review the test data, observe classes, and interview building staff in order to identify main problem areas accurately. The school then develops a plan based on these agreed upon target areas for improvement.

Some TAC days are dedicated to joint-planning schools. State administration money is currently supporting all the technical assistance efforts to these schools. Thus far, no additional program improvement funds have been allocated to joint planning schools. However, two of the schools are entering a consortium to provide Reading Recovery/Early Literacy In-service Course training next year and some program improvement funding will be given to the consortium.

Funding For Program Improvement

One-hundred percent of the program improvement funds have been allocated and distributed to date and all these funds are used for mini-grants to LEAs.

Additionally, the SEA estimates that 25-30 percent of Chapter 1 staff time is spent on responsibilities associated with program improvement. Lacking increased state administration funds, technical assistance to non-program improvement schools, collaborative efforts within the SEA, strategic planning time, technical assistance to LEAs in preschool options, and work on alternative assessment have all been cut back.

Idaho would use additional program improvement funding to link schools with common goals and provide sustained training and follow-up for each of the coalitions.

Exiting Program Improvement

The state improvement plan does not consider schools showing improvement within the initial phase of implementation to have "tested out" of program improvement. In fact, Idaho does not allow schools to exit program improvement before full implementation of their plan, which is developed and implemented over a two-year period.

Increasing Capacity for School Improvement

Idaho would use additional program improvement funding to link schools with common goals and provide sustained training and follow-up for each of these coalitions. The SEA would like to have one full-time staff member coordinate all program improvement efforts, track all the grants, and evaluate the results of program improvement plans. This person could also coordinate SEA efforts at school improvement and accountability. Currently, other than test scores, the SEA does not have the resources to followup and evaluate the effectiveness of state efforts.

Additional Chapter 1 Innovation and Reform

Schoolwide Projects

Number of schoolwide projects in Idaho by school year:

1989-90 2
1990-91 3
1991-92 3

In 1990-91 there were eight schools eligible for Chapter 1 schoolwide projects.

To encourage the development and implementation of schoolwide projects in the state, personal contacts are made with every eligible school to discuss benefits of the project and share information on successful models. The SEA also offers to send the school staff to workshops on schoolwide projects.

Schoolwide projects are invited to be a part of the Idaho Collaborative Schools Project, which is a three-year commitment to extensive staff development in collaborative models. SEA and TAC onsite assistance is available and a planning guide for schools has been disseminated to schoolwide projects.

Changes in curriculum, instruction, and organization have been undertaken in schools through schoolwide projects. Of the three schools currently operating schoolwide projects, one has provided extensive in-service, adopted a schoolwide direct instruction curriculum model, and added a kindergarten teacher. Another one has completely revamped the school and gone to a nongraded system with extensive use of cross-age groupings and cooperative learning groups. The third school is following a collaborative school model.

The SEA makes the following estimates of the number of schools that would be eligible for schoolwide projects if the low-income eligibility threshold were reduced from 75 percent to the following levels: 9 schools at 60 percent, 23 schools at 50 percent, and 100 schools at 40 percent.

Coordination with the Regular Classroom

Coordination with the regular classroom is the number one priority with the Idaho SEA. Schools deemed inadequate in this area must have corrective action plans that address the provision of time and resources for improving coordination. A major SEA emphasis in program improvement has been on the involvement of the whole school in developing the program improvement plan.

Statewide efforts to encourage coordination include the Collaborative Schools Project, DAP training (Developing a Partnership between teachers and paraprofessionals), cooperative learning training, and the Chapter 1-sponsored training in Reading Recovery and E.L.I.C. (Early Literacy In-service Course), which offers integrated language arts approach. Middle school training has also been facilitated by Chapter 1 and has targeted school teams that include Chapter 1 and regular classroom teachers.

A statewide STAR schools teleconference was jointly sponsored by Chapter 1, the SEA language arts department, and Boise State University focusing on improving the teaching of language arts. Coordination was emphasized in this presentation viewed by Chapter 1 and regular classroom teachers. The Idaho statewide conference is planned with the whole school in mind and sessions are available for administrators, classroom teachers, Chapter 1 teachers, and paraprofessionals. These are often attended by a school team including all of these personnel.

Statewide Coordination

The Chapter 1 program improvement efforts have been the primary school improvement effort in many districts. The SEA Chapter 1 office is working to gain support internally to coordinate activities with the SEA instructional division so that overlapping areas of concern such as Effective Schools training, testing, school approval, and school monitoring can be addressed under one plan.

To streamline the administrative and paperwork requirements at the local level, the SEA is considering having applications submitted on diskette for a three-year period, to be updated annually. Several districts are currently submitting their evaluation data on disk.

To coordinate Chapter 1 with preschool programs serving disadvantaged students, Idaho has an early childhood council, which includes Head Start and other providers. The state has received a four-year transition grant to implement pilot transition projects.

The SEA also co-sponsors early childhood workshops, recommends early intervention, and provides guidance to schools interested in sponsoring a collaborative project.

The SEA primarily fosters coordination of Chapter 1 and other programs through three collaborative programs. These include: (1) The Collaborative School Project. At the end of the 1992-93 school year, a collaboration handbook or "how-to" guide will be developed; (2) The Reading Recovery/ Early Literacy In-service Course joint effort to provide early literacy training through the combined funding efforts of Chapter 1, special education, and Chapter 2; and (3) An SEA-organized early childhood council for the purpose of coordinating early childhood efforts in the state. Representatives from Chapter 1, special education, migrant education, English-as-a-second language (ESL)/bilingual education, adult education, Head Start, and representatives from the governor's office are on this council. Because the state provides no preschool funding and has a statute expressly prohibiting state supported services to children below the age of five, publicly supported early childhood is almost exclusively funded by Chapter 1, special education, and migrant education. Three districts offer preschools that are jointly funded by these programs.

The SEA follows the federal policy manual guidelines for services to limited-English-proficient (LEP) students. Because Idaho is operating under a consent decree that mandates that LEAs assess the needs of LEP students and design a plan to provide instruction that meets those needs, the SEA does not fund any LEP services until the LEAs have fulfilled their commitment. If at that point LEP students need additional ESL services and they meet Chapter 1 selection criteria, they may be served.

Because the SEA's ESL/bilingual consultant works in the Compensatory Education unit, there is close coordination and frequent communication about the needs of LEP students. The Idaho SEA is working collaboratively to secure state funding to assist LEAs with high concentrations of LEP students.

The SEA sponsors joint staff meetings to discuss issues that overlap both special education and Chapter 1 and will soon issue written guidance to LEAs on these areas. Both Chapter 1 and special education encourage the use of uniform screening and selection procedures, as well as building study teams to make decisions about the most appropriate placement.

Making a Difference School by School

Schoolwide Project at Overland Elementary School, Burley

Overland Elementary School is beginning its third year as a schoolwide project. From a traditional school, the program has restructured into an ungraded school with students assigned to small heterogenous "families" who move, much like students in a high school setting, every fifty minutes to teachers who are subject area specialists with multilevel materials and highly participatory learning activities. An IBM Writing to Read lab has been added for 1st grade students, and all students have a curriculum enriched with drama, music, problem solving, physical education and positive action. Cooperative learning structures are utilized throughout the school.

Student progress relative to curriculum goals is monitored frequently throughout the course of the school year and reported on a report card designed to show the progress toward mastery of grade-level skills in each major curriculum area. A parent liaison with school counselor credentials has been added to the school staff and parents are used as program aides, presenters, and evaluators.

Program Improvement at Washington Elementary, Jerome

Washington Elementary has participated in program improvement for the 1991-92 and 1992-93 school years. The school, as a result of program improvement efforts, has embarked on a plan to improve the Chapter 1 language arts program. A team of educators representing classroom teachers, special education, Chapter 1, and the building administrator worked over a period of four months to map out a staff development plan to improve the language arts curriculum in the whole school. Their strategy involves twelve-week training in Early Literacy In-service Course for all teachers and paraprofessionals and the training of two teachers in Reading Recovery. The school is also receiving a grant from a state innovative grants program that funds a parent home instruction program.

Washington Elementary has done an excellent job of coordinating various resources into one school improvement package of which Chapter 1 is a component.

Illinois

Chapter 1 Participation and Funding Summary

Participation Levels in School Year (SY) 1990-91

Number of Children Served:	159,314
Percentage of K-12 Children Served:	7%
Number and Percentage of School Districts Receiving Chapter 1 Assistance:	851; 90%
Number and Percentage of Schools Receiving Chapter 1 Assistance:	2,343; 42%

Chapter 1 Services by Grade Span in SY 1990-91

Preschool	3%
Kindergarten	5%
Grades 1-3	36%
Grades 4-6	31%
Grades 7-12	25%

State Funding Levels by School Year

Formula Grants Allocation SY 1990-91, 1991-92:	$224,098,707; $270,088,518
Formula Grants Allocation SY 1992-93:	$290,864,305
Chapter 1 Per Pupil Expenditure SY 1990-91:	$1,600
Program Improvement Allocation SY 1991-92, 1992-93:	$697,432; $1,118,412

Chapter 1 Program Improvement Summary

Number of Schools in Program Improvement in SY 1991-92

Total Number of Schools in Program Improvement:	1045
Percentage of Chapter 1 Schools in Program Improvement:	45%
Number of Schools in Joint Planning:	17

Statewide Minimum Standards for Improvement–A gain in aggregate performance of greater than zero normal curve equivalents (NCEs) in an individual school; greater than zero NCE gain for more than 75 percent of participating children; aggregate grade level scores of greater than zero NCE gains for at least two-thirds of the grade levels; and substantial progress in achieving locally determined desired outcomes.

Chapter 1 Program Improvement

Leveraging Accountability and Higher Performance

It is the intent of the Illinois State Board of Education's Chapter 1 Program to provide appropriate assistance and leadership to the schools in Illinois. The Illinois School Improvement Program provides assistance to school districts toward achievement of the districts' expressed goals and objectives for student achievement., student characteristics, and school finance, and the program applies all state agency resources to the solutions of the problems identified through the program improvement process. The Illinois Chapter 1 State Improvement Plan enhances the State Board of Education's commitment to school improvement by ensuring the quality and effectiveness of all Chapter 1 programs in Illinois.

The Illinois Chapter 1 Committee of Practitioners has constantly held that high standards must be maintained and has established a very demanding three-point set of criteria for identifying schools for program improvement. These criteria, which are in the State Plan, far surpass federal minimum standards and ensure that there are few low-achieving schools missed for program improvement.

Statewide Technical Assistance

Desired outcomes help the school staff develop quality instructional objectives that meet individual student needs. To encourage schools to establish effective locally determined desired outcomes, Illinois has conducted desired outcome workshops. Next year, Illinois will conduct workshops devoted to the development of desired outcomes as an alternative method of measuring student progress.

Once identified for improvement, eighteen Educational Service Centers (ESCs) regionally located throughout the state provide on-site technical assistance to local districts in the program improvement process. Each center has a staff person who has received in-depth training by the state education agency (SEA) in program improvement strategies for districts and schools and who will provide services that include on-site visits and workshops and conferences for LEA Chapter 1 staff in their regions.

In addition to the Educational Service Centers, SEA staff provide consultation to local education agencies (LEAs) through on-site visits, the monitoring process, and by telephone. This contact has been effective in reassuring LEAs that program improvement is not a negative process but an opportunity to look at the weaknesses that might exist in the program and strengthen Chapter 1 as well as the entire school program.

Chapter 1 program improvement was addressed in every workshop or conference held over the past three years,

including the Chapter 1 Directors' fall Conference, Rural Workshops conducted throughout the state, the Chapter 1 Middle and Secondary School Conference, and the Spring Chapter 1 Conference. The ESCs conduct numerous workshops in their regions for LEA Chapter 1 personnel. At these workshops, SEA staff members provide sessions and on-site consultation in the area of program improvement. In addition to these regularly scheduled workshops, the SEA staff members conduct workshops around the state specifically for those schools identified for program improvement.

To coordinate Chapter 1 monitoring and compliance requirements with Chapter 1 program improvement goals, the Chapter 1 monitoring staff has been trained to focus on the quality of programming and instruction. Monitoring is now designed to hold schools accountable for student performance and school improvement, and the focus of monitoring has shifted from process to outcomes, from compliance to achievement, and from requirements to results. Monitoring procedures have been changed to include a large-scale team visit, an administrative visit based on special needs, and a self-review checklist. During the monitoring process, curriculum, instruction, school environment, staff effectiveness, school-community relationships, parental involvement, resource management, and leadership are reviewed. Chapter 1 programs must support the goals and objectives of the district. Finally, the process focuses on the size, scope, and quality of the program design.

Recently, House Bill 885 was passed to develop a new recognition process that will greatly influence how programs are monitored in Illinois.

"Linking Accountability to Student Performance and School Improvement in Illinois" is a study that has served as a basis for the changes in the monitoring process that will be implemented during the 1992-93 school year. Chapter 1 will be influenced positively by this process, which addresses the quality of services to all children.

Successful Models

The ESC consultants involved in the Chapter 1 program improvement process have an extensive background in gifted education programs and models that work for all children. The consultants have drawn on this expertise to provide staff development workshops in cooperative learning, team building, peer tutoring, parent involvement, and other processes that are effective, according to the most recent research.

More program improvement schools are now moving from an isolated program to better coordination with the regular classroom teacher. Programs are conducted through in-class models and extended-day programs. Schools are encouraging principals, teachers, and Chapter 1 teachers to decide together how to do a better job with the amount of time and the number of students they are serving. This coordination has allowed Chapter 1 teachers to be involved in the total education of the Chapter 1 student. There is more emphasis on cooperative learning strategies and team efforts. The classroom includes active learning rather than the passive seatwork that existed before. Teachers are encouraged to use and demonstrate strategies that they know will work. Schools are looking more to programs such as Reading Recovery, Higher Order Thinking Skills (HOTS), and the Essential Schools. Schools are also requiring that Chapter 1 staff be more astute about the goals and objectives of the school in order to provide activities to support students in reaching these goals.

Exiting Program Improvement

Seventy-six of the 286 schools identified for Chapter 1 program improvement based on the 1989-90 testing cycle tested out before their plans were fully implemented. The SEA estimates that the majority tested out because of development and at least partial implementation of their plan, not because of an aberration in test scores.

Illinois views program improvement as a positive means of improving the education of disadvantaged children in Chapter 1. Districts also view program improvement as an impetus to develop strategies and correct problems hindering success in the classroom. Very few of the program improvement schools have indicated a desire not to continue the efforts.

Joint SEA/LEA Plans

During the summer of 1991, the SEA staff developed a comprehensive design of Chapter 1 joint planning for program improvement. The two-phase, four-step program improvement process builds on the current status of the school program and toward the accomplishment of the desired outcomes. To assist the attendance center in implementing a successful Chapter 1 joint plan, each step is broken into activities that clarify the approach and include specific tasks necessary to complete the process.

The plan presents only the basic elements of planning and development for the Chapter 1 program improvement effort to accommodate the unique needs and varied circumstances of the diverse student populations throughout the state. The school staff might find it necessary to customize (delete, add, modify, or expand) the process or activities to be more applicable to the local situation. The final activity (assessment) the improvement outcomes provide is a solid foundation for the process. As the school completes and then repeats the process, it will reach closer alignment among its desired objectives, instruction, and assessment.

The process begins with an analysis of how well the students in the school are meeting its expectations for the program. A comprehensive blueprint is then designed based on a thorough analysis of the strengths, weaknesses, and resources of the school. The plan is developed and implemented by a school team of administrators, teachers, and parents. The blueprint guides the process and provides for needed intervention, organization, and activities consistent with the total process. An improvement structure outlines ways to

bring about specific changes, which are put into place and supported through training, follow-up, and assessment. Before involving the entire staff in the process, the school administration should determine the readiness, willingness, and capacity of the school to implement the process.

The Chapter 1 Program Improvement Joint Planning process consists of four steps: analyze performance information; design a blueprint for improvement; develop an improvement structure; and put the improvement into practice.

The SEA, through the ESC consultants, provides on-site one-to-one consultation with the staff in developing the joint plan. Each school in joint planning will be offered a mini-grant of $2,000 to assist with the development of the plan. Additional funds will be provided based on the identified need of the LEA and the extensiveness of the improvements.

Funding for Program Improvement

Approximately 80 percent of the program improvement money is being used for mini-grants to LEAs rather than direct SEA technical assistance. All 1990-91 program improvement funds were distributed to LEAs and ESCs for the program improvement efforts.

Approximately 60 percent of Chapter 1 administration staff time is devoted to responsibilities for program improvement. All state technical assistance in program improvement is supported by state administrative funds. No Chapter 1 administrative activities have been cut back as the result of increased time devoted to program improvement. Rather, staff responsibilities have been shifted and two staff members have been added.

Increasing Capacity for School Improvement

Because of Chapter 1 program improvement, evaluation data are used more extensively. As a result, there is the need for additional development in the area of testing and management of performance data. Administrative funds will be needed to improve the evaluation system at the SEA.

Illinois is in the process of developing a computerized data management system that will integrate the entire Chapter 1 program, including information from the application, program improvement, evaluation, and fiscal and instructional programming. While this is the beginning of the process, it will take an increased amount of money to expand the system to permit LEAs to develop a process by which they will be able to readily transmit information through the automation process. By using state-of-the-art technology, the SEA will be able to better provide a management process that will benefit all districts. The computerization of Chapter 1 was achieved through grant-back funds. Additional administrative funds will be needed to maintain the system.

In addition to the use of technology, additional staff is needed to continue monitoring for quality programs. When addressing quality in Chapter 1 programs, a program review takes much longer than checking compliance issues. Over the past year new staff has been added for this purpose.

Schoolwide Projects

Number of schoolwide projects in Illinois by school year:

1989-90	12
1990-91	13
1991-92	25

In 1990-91, there were 159 schools eligible for schoolwide projects.

To encourage the development and implementation of schoolwide projects, the SEA continually informs LEAs about the schoolwide program option. The schoolwide option has been presented at both state and regional Chapter 1 conferences. In 1991, a special conference was held for districts eligible for schoolwide projects. In addition, SEA Chapter 1 staff has contacted all districts with eligible schools with information on schoolwide projects.

The SEA provides constant technical assistance to the local school district and specific schools once the decision has been made to pursue a schoolwide program project design. There is an initial schoolwide program in-service that is provided to the school staff. Prior to that visit, a meeting with district central administration is held to explain the district commitment and obligation to a Chapter 1 schoolwide project. It is paramount that the district thoroughly understand its responsibility in a Chapter 1 schoolwide project. It is requested that the schoolwide plan be formally acknowledged at the district's board of education meeting.

After the initial meetings and staff in-service, the technical assistance from the SEA continues during the planning year until the written plan is finalized. Once the schoolwide plan has been approved by the SEA, technical assistance is provided as needed, but at least once a quarter.

The focus of monitoring has shifted from process to outcomes, from compliance to achievement, and from requirements to results.

Additional Chapter 1 Innovation and Reform

Changes in curriculum, instruction, and organization have been undertaken in schools through schoolwide projects. Curriculum changes involve more faculty freedom in curriculum choice, more flexibility and creativity in curriculum design that better meets the needs of students, better integration of the curriculum as the school's rather than classroom or grade curriculum, and more in-depth staff development. The faculty in these schools are eager to consider different models of instruction and new materials are explored. The instruction is more focused on the overall

school goals, and the concept that all children can and will learn permeates most schoolwide projects.

Organizational changes include site-based management; a governing committee consisting of teachers, administrators, parents, community members, and sometimes students that plans and reviews all the school's activities; and parent/staff investment in the project. Staff is often shifted to make better use of staff members strengths. Parents are routinely informed of student progress and are involved in many activities.

To help ensure maintenance of effort, districts receive in-service training on this issue and are requested to discuss maintaining effort with the school board.

Less than 10 percent of schoolwide projects will have difficulty meeting the performance improvement requirements of the law. Plans at each school are evaluated annually to ensure that programs stay on target in improving student performance.

The SEA estimates that the following number of schools in Illinois would be eligible for schoolwide projects if the low-income eligibility threshold were lowered from 75 percent to the following levels: 479 schools at 60 percent, 620 schools at 50 percent, and over 700 schools at 40 percent.

Coordination with the Regular Classroom

The SEA encourages LEAs to provide training for both the regular teacher who is working with the Chapter 1 student and the Chapter 1 teacher. This joint training provides credibility to the changes emphasized in Chapter 1 and enhances coordination and communication between the teachers. After all, collaboration can only occur if there is common ground to spark dialogue and shared points of reference for working with children. The training provided in Chapter 1 is state-of-the-art staff development in reading, mathematics, and language arts; it will benefit the regular teacher as we

Coordination is also stressed during program monitoring visits. Districts are required to show documentation that Chapter 1 and regular education teachers have regularly scheduled meetings and a formal system to share information. The SEA stresses that there are many ways to accomplish coordination in all aspects of the program—from monitoring to program improvement.

Workshops conducted by the SEA are designed for the Chapter 1 and regular teacher to develop curriculum and instruction that will best meet the needs of all students. Specialized training in programs, such as cooperative learning and peer tutoring, are sponsored by the SEA for Chapter 1 and regular education teachers to help them plan coordinated instructional programs. SEA staff have also provided presentations and on-site visits to assist districts in implementing successful in-class programs.

Statewide Coordination

In Illinois, Chapter 1 program improvement efforts began as a separate function from the school improvement program that was underway at the state level. Because both were in the beginning stages of development, districts were encouraged to coordinate to ensure that the Chapter 1 improvement efforts supported district and school program improvement.

Both Chapter 1 and the State School Improvement Process require plans. In the State School Improvement Process, district and school objectives are written to reflect state goals in all subject matters. The LEAs were required in their Chapter 1 program improvement plans to reflect these goals and objectives as well.

The SEA is coordinating Chapter 1 program improvement with other state and federal programs. For example, there are joint application planning workshops for LEAs applying for Chapter 2, State Reading Improvement Funds, and Chapter 1. Program improvement plans also refer to all resources available, which usually include data from the State School Improvement Program, Chapter 2, and the State Reading Improvement Program.

To streamline the administrative paperwork requirements at the local level, the SEA Chapter 1 administration is currently in the process of automating the Chapter 1 program in all areas. The complete automation of the Chapter 1 program in cooperation with the Data Management Section should be completed by the summer of 1992.

In an effort to coordinate Chapter 1 with Head Start as well as with state and local preschool programs serving disadvantaged students, the Illinois State Board of Education has entered into an interagency agreement with Head Start. The purpose of the agreement is to foster collaboration in the planning and implementation of preschool programs. At the SEA, the agreement affects the state-funded pre-kindergarten program for children at risk of academic failure, the special education program for three- to five-year olds, and Chapter 1 preschool programs.

The State of Illinois has a large state preschool program for three- to five-year old children (funded in FY92 at $71.5 million). Chapter 1 funds are used in many districts to supplement these programs. The SEA has cosponsored several workshops on early childhood education and parenting with staff of the state preschool programs. These include week-long parenting seminars for the parents of minority children. The SEA has had several meetings with local Head Start programs to present information and to share models for parenting. The SEA is also coordinating closely with several family literacy programs in preparation for the Even Start program.

At the fall and spring Chapter 1 Conferences, LEAs were provided guidance on coordinating Chapter 1, state compensatory education, special education, and bilingual education funds. Special education and Chapter 1 staff participated in joint presentations and discussions on how these programs can be coordinated and how to determine which students qualify for which programs. SEA Chapter 1 and special education staff have held a series of

meetings since August 1991 to discuss and prepare guidelines for LEAs. The first draft of these guidelines is complete but will not be issued until the SEA has received clearance from the U.S. Department of Education (USDE). In the meantime, guidance letters received from USDE have been distributed to LEAs.

Similar meetings have also been held with bilingual staff. The bilingual staff has provided information on limited English proficient (LEP) students and a major effort to coordinate Chapter 1 and bilingual funds will occur in the establishment of a Bilingual Reading Recovery Program in the Chicago area. Reading Recovery Programs are largely supported by Chapter 1; but when training is available in Spanish, the bilingual program will also become a supporter.

There is no special criteria that Illinois recommends in the selection process relative to LEP students. Once the LEP student has successfully completed the English-as-a-second language (ESL) program and is being mainstreamed into the regular education program, the district's eligibility criteria requirements for Chapter 1 are used to determine if the student will receive Chapter 1 services.

Making a Difference School by School

Schoolwide Project at Harrison Elementary School, Peoria

The schoolwide project at Harrison Elementary is currently in its the third year. The Harrison schoolwide plan was designed to better meet the needs of a population that is 96 percent low-income and that has a 47 percent mobility rate. The complete schoolwide plan was developed collectively by faculty, staff, parents, administration, and other community persons.

A restructuring of the school environment delivery systems, student expectations, organizational structure, and parental involvement is visible throughout the schoolwide project. The school is committed to enabling students to develop a positive self-image and accept the responsibility for their own education. The school promotes parental involvement and accelerated learning opportunities.

The following schoolwide components are incorporated into the Harrison Elementary schoolwide plan: a pre-kindergarten program for four-year-olds, a developmental kindergarten program, a developmental 1st grade program, a continuous kindergarten-1st grade year-round program, a Writing-to-Read laboratory program, an elementary reading laboratory program, a discovery room for global education, a parent resource library/continuing education program, extended-day activities, and a summer school prevention of failure program.

After preliminary evaluations, the Harrison schoolwide project has demonstrated that the educational goals have been effectively implemented. This includes improved cognitive performance among the students, a friendlier and safer social and learning environment, a better understanding of individual differences, increased parent involvement in their children's education, and continuation of parental education through GED completion and/or junior college career program enrollment.

Program Improvement at Lovejoy Elementary School, Alton

Lovejoy Elementary School is currently operating a basic skills resource program that provides special instructional intervention for students behind their classmates in academic progress in the basic areas of reading and/or mathematics. Children exit the program as areas of weakness are corrected. The instructional period is a minimum of thirty minutes per day.

The program was identified based on testing the fall of 1990 and 1991. The areas in need were reading vocabulary and reading comprehension. Lovejoy Elementary School services grades 2, 3, 4, and 5 and is a member of the Accelerated School Network in Illinois.

The goal of the improvement plan was to improve the achievement level of the Chapter 1 students in the 2nd through 5th grade at Lovejoy School. The objectives were to identify students who did not make an NCE gain, to determine the reason(s) for lack of achievement, to identify curriculum elements on which to concentrate for the rest of the 1991-92 school year, to identify student learning styles, and to identify resources that will help increase individual student progress.

The activities planned to reach the goal included the following: Chapter 1 teachers and parents attended workshops to analyze California Achievement Test (CAT) test results and plan test-taking strategies; Chapter 1 teachers attended a staff development workshop on at-risk instructional strategies; and Chapter 1 teachers and parents attended workshops designed to get more parents involved with the education of their children.

Appropriate materials will be obtained that will correlate with academic areas in need of improvement. There will be increased communication between the regular classroom teacher and the Chapter 1 teacher concerning specific skills that need to be emphasized and reinforced. After-school tutoring will be provided to students in need. Regular and Chapter 1 teachers will be provided with time for planning and reviewing student evaluations.

The evaluation of the program improvement effort will be based on the individual and group gain of spring 1990 and spring 1991 test scores. Also, an evaluation of student progress will be conducted, which includes other measures besides test scores.

Indiana

Chapter 1 Participation and Funding Summary

Participation Levels in School Year (SY) 1990-91

Number of Children Served:	94,258
Percentage of K-12 Children Served:	9%
Number and Percentage of School Districts Receiving Chapter 1 Assistance:	291; 99%
Number and Percentage of Schools Receiving Chapter 1 Assistance:	1,126; 62%

Chapter 1 Services by Grade Span in SY 1990-91

Preschool	1%
Kindergarten	10%
Grades 1-3	45%
Grades 4-6	32%
Grades 7-12	12%

State Funding Levels by School Year

Formula Grants Allocation SY 1990-91, 1991-92:	$71,751,410; $84,503,558
Formula Grants Allocation SY 1992-93:	$93,472,755
Chapter 1 Per Pupil Expenditure SY 1990-91:	$761
Program Improvement Allocation SY 1991-92; 1992-93:	$214,576; $354,821

Chapter 1 Program Improvement Summary

Number of Schools in Program Improvement in SY 1991-92

Total Number of Schools in Program Improvement:	326
Percentage of Chapter 1 Schools in Program Improvement:	29%
Number of Schools in Joint Planning:	35

Statewide Minimum Standards for Improvement–A minimum of four desired outcomes including a gain of at least one normal curve equivalent (NCE) in basic and advanced skills, grades 2-12; non-NCE desired outcome(s) for grades 2-12; and specific desired outcome(s) for preschool, kindergarten, and grade 1.

Chapter 1 Program Improvement

Leveraging Accountability and Higher Performance

The Indiana SEA believes that program improvement is a healthy process and an opportunity for growth. It is not seen as a quick fix, one-size-fits-all system, but a means of taking a careful look at the Chapter 1 program and developing a thoughtful plan for its improvement. It is an opportunity for a school to examine its existing Chapter 1 program, to identify current problems, and to target possibilities for change. School-based teams are an active and integral part of this process, and these teams are encouraged to make program changes through a review of the existing program, development of a program improvement plan and implementation of the plan.

Indiana raised its minimum standards for program improvement in 1990 and 1991. In 1990, the NCE gain was raised from the minimum zero to a minimum of one NCE, and LEAs were required to meet the majority of their non-NCE desired outcomes for preschool-grade twelve programs. In 1991, LEAs were required to write separate non-NCE desired outcomes for early childhood services (preschool, kindergarten, and grade 1) and for grades 2-12; LEAs also had to meet the substantial progress criteria for each non-NCE desired outcome in preschool through grade 12.

The Indiana Committee of Practitioners (COP) has consistently advocated high expectations regarding Chapter 1 program improvement, both in terms of NCE gains and non-NCE desired outcomes. In October, 1991, the SEA and Committee of Practitioners discussed a proposed increase in the standards for the 1992-93 school year. The COP members persuasively argued that continual changes in the standards were confusing to the LEAs, particularly in the face of the upcoming reauthorization changes.

The Indiana program improvement identification process accurately identifies schools according to current standards. Strong quality control procedures help ensure a good identification process. The SEA provides free computer software to LEAs for calculating both individual and aggregate NCE performance and reporting summarized non-NCE desired outcome results. The SEA implements a rigorous paper review and computer quality control check of LEA-submitted data.

While the Indiana process provides accurate identification according to current standards, there are complications within the way schools are identified for program improvement. These include: credibility problems when a single indicator (rather than multiple indicators) is used to signal a school in need of improvement; the need for additional strategies in dealing with schools with

small numbers of Chapter 1 students; difficulties related to the content area focus of program improvement (e.g., a school may continuously stay in Year 1 status due to yearly flip-flop of content areas, or may be in Year 1 status in reading and joint status for math); and complexities relating to LEA understanding of requirements for measuring progress based on the instruction area of "primary focus."

Statewide Technical Assistance

The Indiana Department of Education uses a variety of approaches to help schools establish locally-determined desired outcomes. The SEA stresses the importance of measurable desired outcomes that focus on students' success in the regular classroom, attainment of grade level proficiency, and improvement in basic and more advanced skills. LEAs are encouraged to use a process for developing these goals that emphasizes, gathering input from multiple resources identifying key sources for those desired outcomes (e.g., annual needs assessment, district curricula goals), defining substantial progress as acceptable progress for a program that is making a difference for students, and setting up procedures to track progress toward the desired outcomes during the school year.

The SEA's technical assistance to LEAs on desired outcomes is provided through workshops by SEA staff at SEA-sponsored conferences, guidelines and examples in workshop handouts and in the *Indiana Chapter 1 Handbook*, activities at Program Improvement Institutes in which schools review and consider the impact of their desired outcomes, and consultations with LEAs, particularly when the local evaluation results indicate that higher standards are needed in an LEA's Chapter 1 application.

Indiana emphasizes a team approach to program improvement both through the SEA and LEAs working together and through LEA teams involving administrators, classroom teachers, parents and Chapter 1 staff. This team approach is promoted because the SEA values multiple perspectives in the improvement of Chapter 1 students' education and wants to foster ownership and commitment to the improvement of programs.

To help LEAs implement program improvement, the SEA encourages use of a four-step process: diagnose and summarize data about learning and program needs thereby identifying the focus for program improvement; set goals based on those focused needs; select strategies and tactics for change that will achieve those goals; and evaluate the change process.

The SEA uses several strategies to help program improvement schools understand this philosophy and knowledgeably implement these four steps. The SEA staff have developed a six-day series of Program Improvement Planning (PIP) Institutes that are conducted regionally throughout the state for schools in the planning stage of program improvement. These institutes are attended by school PIP Teams, and the sessions are planned on an interactive, fast-paced schedule that builds a cohesive, working team and leads to a well-focused plan.

In addition to the PIP Institutes, the SEA has produced a program improvement guide that details these four steps and provides activities that PIP Teams can complete at the local level. This guide was originally developed in 1990, but was revised in 1991 to include additional help and research-based information.

A complementary extension of the winter and spring PIP Institutes are one-day Chapter 1 Effectiveness Conferences. These are held at the same four regional sites as the PIP Institutes, and attendance is open to PIP Teams as well as Chapter 1 administrators and staff, principals and classroom teachers in Chapter 1 schools. Sessions provide examples of best practices, highlights from school effectiveness research, and current instructional strategies. These conferences have been well-attended and well-received by both Chapter 1 and regular school staff.

In addition to the Effectiveness Conferences, the SEA mails bi-monthly Chapter 1 BULLETINs with research highlights and best practices to each local Chapter 1 program .

The SEA continually emphasizes that a professional attitude in education today requires that educators take a critical look at their practices as well as find ways to make good practices better, and better practices the best. This attitude is reflected in the SEA's institutes, conferences, and correspondence with LEA Chapter 1 contact persons and p rincipals of Chapter 1 program improvement schools.

Evidence supports that this message is being well-received at the local level. Although the PIP Institutes for schools in the planning phase of program improvement are voluntary, seventy to eighty percent of eligible schools have chosen to attend and develop their plans in 1989, 1990, and 1991.

The SEA recognizes the importance of coordinating its Chapter 1 monitoring, compliance requirements, and program effectiveness goals. Indiana is shifting from its former emphasis on compliance monitoring to one of program effectiveness, especially as demonstrated by Chapter 1 students' success in the regular classroom program. The SEA has developed an on-site program review process that focuses on the Chapter 1 building rather than the traditional LEA/central office focus.

This new process involves a team of SEA consultant(s), the building principal, Chapter 1 staff and regular classroom teacher(s) who take an in-depth look at areas such as student selection, instructional practices, evaluation, and parent/community involvement. This results in a specific plan for enhancement in the reviewed schools. The on-site review process has been discussed with and refined by the Indiana Committee of Practitioners.

A companion development for this new on-site approach is a compliance checklist to be completed on a three-year cycle by LEA Chapter 1 contact

persons. This checklist will cover program requirements not monitored through other means. SEA program consultants will review these compliance items and follow-up on specific issues needing LEA attention. While this may include on-site visits, it is expected that there will be fewer compliance on-site visits than in previous years. The first three-year cycle for this compliance checklist will begin in the fall of 1992.

Successful Models

Whole language approaches that integrate reading and writing, literature-based reading instruction, and thematic (cross-curricula) instruction reflect the trends in curricular and instructional trends for Indiana program improvement schools. In 1991, the Indiana Department of Education published math proficiencies (i.e., state curriculum standards) based on the NCTM standards, and these are widely reflected in the program improvement plans related to math curriculum and instruction for Chapter 1 math programs.

There has been little adoption of package models for program improvement, although one program improvement school has initiated a *Success for All* model in the 1991-92 school year. A number of schools have expressed interest in the *Reading Recovery* program, but encounter difficulty with the time and expense involved in this program's year-long training component. To date, no school has adopted the *Reading Recovery* model.

Exiting Program Improvement

One hundred twenty nine schools identified for Chapter 1 program improvement based on 1989-90 data tested out of program improvement before they were required to fully implement their plans. Overall, this represents sixty-three percent of the schools identified for program improvement that year.

These schools were identified in the second cycle of program improvement in Indiana. The SEA perceived that few schools exited program improvement because of significant program changes during those first two years, although it is possible that partial implementation of a school's program improvement plan may have played a role in some cases. To link testing out of program improvement with implementation of a program improvement plan in those early years would be, at best, a partial explanation.

Other reasons seem equally likely. Certainly, anomalies occur in test data from year to year, but, by 1990 and 1991, there was also heightened LEA awareness about program factors related to program improvement and other requirements in the 1988 law. For example, the SEA noted that a number of schools tightened aspects of their program operation, such as student selection procedures, the tracking of student progress, and increased coordination with the regular classroom program. Although these specific factors may not have been addressed on a program improvement plan, they may partially explain why some schools exited program improvement.

The SEA has gained more experience with program improvement with each successive year, and SEA assistance to LEAs has become more intensive over this time. The SEA expects that the number of schools exiting program improvement as a result of actual program change (i.e., partial or full implementation of their PIP plan) will continue to increase as a result of SEA assistance, increased awareness, and LEA efforts.

The SEA encourages schools that exit program improvement to continue in the improvement process even though these schools are not required to do so. Each school-based team is required to submit a detailed draft improvement plan for the next school year in May (before it is known whether the school will exit from program improvement). The team efforts and ownership of this plan support its implementation the next year, even if the school is no longer officially in program improvement. In the SEA's letter to the school verifying that it has exited from program improvement, schools are explicitly encouraged to implement their previously drafted plan for improvement.

Joint SEA/LEA Plans

The 1991-92 school year is the first year for joint program improvement in Indiana. Three procedures are being used to establish joint plans with these schools:

1. In a winter and spring implementation institute, SEA staff will guide joint implementing schools through activities that help them review and refine their current year's PIP implementation, and work on a locally-developed PIP for the next school year.

2. The development of an on-site program review process involves a team comprised of SEA consultant(s), the building principal, Chapter 1 staff and regular classroom teacher(s). This process takes an in-depth look at areas such as student selection, instructional practices, evaluation, and parent/community involvement and results in a specific plan for enhancement in these joint program improvement schools.

3. Individual SEA consultants make on-site visits to schools in joint program improvement to discuss their planning and implementation process as well as progress toward a more effective program with Chapter 1 students. These SEA-LEA consultations have resulted in substantial program changes in several districts.

LEA Chapter 1 basic grant and program improvement funds support the participation of LEA teams in the SEA-sponsored PIP Institutes, and the Indiana Program Improvement Plan designates joint program improvement schools as "first priority" for PIP funds. All SEA technical assistance is provided via SEA administrative funds. State administrative dollars pay all SEA staff salaries (including time spent on program improvement activities), the costs involved in planning and producing the PIP Institutes, and all costs related to SEA on-site visits to LEAs.

Because this is the first year for joint SEA/LEA program improvement activi-

ties in Indiana, it is too soon to comment on the plans designed and results of those plans.

Funding for Program Improvement

All of Indiana's 1990-91 and 1991-92 program improvement funds have been spent. Approximately 85 percent of Indiana's program improvement funds are being used for mini-grants to LEAs, with remaining funds being used for costs related to LEA participation at the SEA PIP Institutes, which evolved as a result of technical assistance requests from program improvement schools.

During the 1990-91 school year, approximately 25 percent of Chapter 1 administration staff time was devoted to program improvement. Because of considerable restructuring of SEA staff responsibilities, priorities and activities, this has risen to at least 75 percent for the 1991-92 school year. The percentage is expected to increase in the years ahead. One-hundred percent of the SEA technical assistance in program improvement is supported by state administrative funds.

Increased attention and time devoted to program improvement caused Indiana SEA staff to cut back on a number of Chapter 1 administrative activities this year. This includes a significant reduction in the compliance on-site monitoring.

Increasing Capacity for School Improvement

At the time the 1988 law was passed, the Indiana Department of Education recognized the need for increasing each SEA staff member's competencies relating to program improvement and SEA technical assistance. In 1988, the SEA contracted with a staff development/ program improvement consultant to work with the state agency, and a program improvement/evaluation specialist was hired to fill a vacant program consultant position. Both of these individuals were former TAC consultants, knowledgeable in Chapter 1, and with specific expertise in evaluation and school effectiveness research. Both of these positions have been paid by state administrative funds during the period 1988 to 1992.

Indiana is fortunate to have a staff of dedicated professionals who have devoted significant time and effort to SEA staff development. The results are evident in the major shift of SEA staff members' responsibilities and priorities during the 1991-92 school year. But despite the progress made to date, there are significant limitations that may affect these efforts in the years ahead.

Given the number and percent of program improvement schools in Indiana and the high level of program improvement activities, Indiana does not receive adequate program improvement funds to meet the identified needs in the eligible schools. Indiana has many ways to use additional program improvement funds at the local level.

Resource limitations compel the same number of SEA staff members to do more and more in order to appropriately administer the Chapter 1 program from the state level. In Indiana, Chapter 1 state staff members are paid inadequate salaries for the work and expertise required (generally, annual salaries are in the range of $30,000 to $35,000), and there have been no state salary increases for the last two years.

The SEA's system for computerized data management only partially fits with the needs of Chapter 1. The requests for programming assistance and quality control checks stretch beyond the resources available in the SEA's computer division. The resulting lack of computer programs and quality control checks increases the work burden on Chapter 1 staff.

The current TAC system is also inadequate to address SEA needs, as TAC services are stretched too thinly to provide the in-depth and long-term assistance that would benefit SEA staff. There is a need for additional, well-qualified staff.

Additional Chapter 1 Innovation and Reform

Schoolwide Projects

Number of schoolwide projects in Indiana by school year:

1989-90	4
1990-91	6
1991-92	7

During the 1990-91 school year, 33 schools were eligible for schoolwide projects.

Each winter, district contact persons with potentially eligible schoolwide buildings (e.g., 65-70 percent or greater low-income according to the previous year's target area selection data) are invited to an informational meeting.

To promote adequate pre-planning, introduce models and strategies for initiating the projects, and verify the district's level of commitment, the state director and SEA program consultant assigned to that LEA meet on-site with the building principal, Chapter 1 staff, and classroom teacher representatives. Visits generally occur by the end of February. LEA staff also attend the regional TAC/ U.S. Department of Education schoolwide meetings, and staff from each potential schoolwide project visit at least one currently operating Indiana schoolwide project.

The following curricular, instructional and organizational changes have occurred in schoolwide projects: more hours devoted to staff development; staff development that is inclusive of all staff (e.g.,teachers,librarians, auxiliary staff, and enrichment program staff), a focus of staff development on meeting the needs of all students, but especially of special needs students, resolution of scheduling issues, more flexible use of equipment and instructional supplies, use of more appropriate delivery models, reduction in the pupil-teacher ratio, increased consensus and understanding of school/program goals across the school staff, increase in parental involvement and expanded support (often on-site) for parents and families, more

student support services (e.g., guidance, attendance, health care), and a greater sense of schoolwide accountability for the success of all students.

In Indiana, one additional criterion must be met before a schoolwide project will be approved — the building principal must have a full understanding of the expectations and accept responsibility for schoolwide program accountability.

The SEA estimates that 28 percent of the currently operating projects (i.e., two of seven) could have problems meeting the performance improvement requirements of the law. Two of the schools are experiencing unanticipated communication, leadership and support problems from their central office. The SEA is learning that change at the building level is not enough. The support and leverage required from the LEA's central office level is critical to program success.

If the low-income eligibility threshold were reduced from 75 percent to the following levels, the SEA estimates that the number of schools eligible for schoolwide projects would increase to: 92 schools at 60 percent, 150 schools at 50 percent, and 239 schools at 40 percent.

Coordination with the Regular Classroom

The SEA encourages LEAs to provide Chapter 1 services in the regular classroom when such services are appropriately designed and well-delivered. In-class services can be one means of reducing the problems associated with the labeling of students within schools. However, the SEA also believes that in-class services alone are not a panacea. The SEA emphasis is on effectiveness of services, regardless of their location, and on coordination of instruction. The SEA uses every opportunity to promote this message to LEAs.

Coordination with regular classroom instruction is based on locally-developed models that include joint classroom-Chapter 1 teacher meetings to discuss and plan instruction and procedures for communicating about and tracking students' progress. The specifics of these plans vary from LEA to LEA.

The SEA uses several approaches to provide in-service training to help Chapter 1 and classroom teachers better teach Chapter 1 students, regardless of the specific instructional format (e.g., in-class, pull-out, after-school). For the last three years, LEAs have been encouraged to attend the annual Chapter 1 Conference as a team. Teams could include not only Chapter 1 administrators and staff, but Chapter 1 principals and classroom teachers. In 1992, the SEA is holding Regional Effectiveness Conferences to facilitate principal and classroom teachers' attendance.

Indiana's strategy for program improvement emphasizes a team approach from the beginning. This team includes both Chapter 1 and regular classroom instructors who work together to develop a plan for increasing the effectiveness of the Chapter 1 program. One of the most common PIP goals has been improved coordination of instruction.

Increasingly, the SEA is stressing the involvement of the school principal in all aspects of the Chapter 1 program, including SEA-sponsored PIP Institutes and Effectiveness Conferences. The SEA feels, and research endorses, that what a school principal values and emphasizes will be reflected in the activities of that school's staff.

Statewide Coordination

All Indiana LEAs are scheduled for a Performance Based Accreditation (PBA) review once every five years, and school-level Chapter 1 programs are reviewed as part of that process. Since PBA occurs on a defined schedule and Chapter 1 accountability requirements are ongoing, there is not sufficient overlap to merge the two processes.

However, since both Chapter 1 program improvement and PBA share a similar research base (e.g., change as a team-based process), district staff are encouraged to integrate the two when a building is scheduled for PBA and identified for Chapter 1 program improvement in the same year. This helps to eliminate redundancies and minimize the staff workload related to these projects.

SEA efforts to streamline administrative and paperwork requirements at the local level are evidenced through development of a software package for districts' annual evaluation computation and reporting; creation of an electronic transmittal system for reporting evaluation data via computer modem; maintenance of the current basic grant application forms, thereby reducing the changes needed at the local level; and promotion and/or facilitation of an LEA-to-LEA regional network to encourage the sharing of efficient strategies for meeting program requirements.

Indiana is shifting from its former emphasis on compliance monitoring to one of program effectiveness.

The SEA encourages the use of Chapter 1 funds for preschool and the early primary years of school. The number of Chapter 1-funded preschool projects continues to grow in Indiana. Successful models have been shared by practitioners at statewide and regional in-service conferences sponsored by the SEA.

A new law, effective in January 1992, funds *Step Ahead*, a state-sponsored program that addresses early childhood educational services on a countywide basis. The focus is on inter-agency collaboration and avoiding duplicative services in meeting the needs of the whole child and even including parents and siblings. Step Ahead administrative staff have presented sessions at each of the Regional Effectiveness Conferences this year. The SEA's Even Start consult-

ant serves on an inter-agency early childhood task force to further collaborative efforts as well.

The SEA, as part of an ongoing staff development plan, has assigned each staff consultant a topic for independent study. The studies include: early childhood and parent and family involvement (which also includes Even Start-type initiatives), strategies for assessment in early childhood programs, and coordination between Chapter 1 and special education.

The SEA works directly with districts interested in developing models to address the needs of all students via in-class models. One district spent a year researching models and visiting other sites in nearby states. They successfully piloted an in-class, collaborative model for special education, Chapter 1, and at-risk programs that provided all special services in the regular classroom. Though students were identified for specific programs for administrative reasons (e.g., evaluation requirements), students were not labeled and then served via supplementary program-specific staff.

Instead, Chapter 1, at-risk, and special education staff augmented the regular classroom teacher's instruction for special needs students by working with all students, as needed. Throughout the course of the instructional day, the classroom teacher had at least one other specially-funded instructor in the room. Due to the project's initial success, they will expand services to additional grade levels within this school. The SEA selected this district to present at a Regional Effectiveness Conference to promote further awareness and consideration of this approach.

By law, if limited English proficient (LEP) children have needs stemming from educational deprivation and not solely from their lack of proficiency in English, the children must be identified as eligible and selected for Chapter 1 services on the same basis as other Chapter 1 children. The LEA must coordinate the Chapter 1 services with the services required.

Because there are no state or federal funds available to provide LEP services, most Indiana LEAs are presumed to provide services to LEP students in the regular classroom program. Classroom teachers supposedly receive staff development related to those services. Since LEP services are presumed to be provided within the regular classroom, Chapter 1 is considered to be supplementary for these students. In many LEAs, LEP students are placed in Chapter 1 programs. Because of the lack of appropriate LEP support to classroom teachers, it is often questionable whether Chapter 1 is meeting educational needs or language-based needs for LEP students.

An ever-increasing number of children previously served by special education teachers in a resource room are now, through reliance on the least-restrictive environment, placed full-time in the regular classroom. Though technical assistance is provided to the classroom teacher to meet these students' special needs, no additional help (i.e., direct assistance to the student) is given by special education. These children are often targeted for Chapter 1 supplementary assistance. LEA Chapter 1 administrators are concerned about meeting the needs of all students, but feel frustrated by Chapter 1 evaluation and accountability requirements for all participants, including special education students.

The current Chapter 1 law and regulations provide only a single, vaguely worded statement regarding the coordination of Chapter 1 and special education services. LEA Chapter 1 administrators want and need a variety of specific models that clearly demonstrate how the selection, evaluation and accountability requirements in both Chapter 1 and special education can be met when serving the same students.

Making a Difference School by School

Schoolwide Project at Vaile Elementary School, Richmond

Vaile School is in its first year as a schoolwide project. A professionally led retreat helped the school staff conduct an initial needs assessment and use site-based decision making and consensus to develop a vision statement and a clear, focused mission. This led to the establishment of five task forces; increased expectations for students' success in academics, behavior, and attendance; and a plan that added three new staff positions at Vaile School. These were:

- a reading specialist who provides in-class modeling and team-teaching to help classroom teachers learn new instructional and management techniques as well as to develop and implement a comprehensive, cohesive academic program,
- a media specialist who collaborates with the reading specialist on the school's resource needs and helps plan courses of action for specific new instructional or curriculum changes, and
- a parent liaison who consults with staff and provides staff development on ways to involve and communicate with parents and who works closely with the kindergarten staff and parents.

The parent liaison has worked with kindergarten teachers in creating a supportive, non-threatening program of parenting skills. She also makes home visits and serves as a liaison for families and community agencies providing support help to these families.

A modular unit will be used as a parent center and will contain a check-out library of learning activities and reading materials for parents to use at home with their children, computers for the literacy training of parents, and a washer and dryer for parents' use as well as staff use when children need clean clothes.

The parent liaison will be available at the parent center when she is not participating in kindergarten classes, staff

activities, or making kindergarten home visits. The person in this role is the parents' advocate and will initiate or make their needs known to the appropriate parties.

Vaile Elementary School has been granted a waiver by the Indiana State School Board in order to implement its restructuring plan. Vaile has adapted the traditional five hours per day, five days per week instructional plan to be four-and-half six-hour instructional days each week. Each Wednesday is a three-hour-day for students, and students' Wednesday afternoons are used for experiential outings that may include trips to art and historical museums, local colleges and technical institutes, the opera, orchestras, and activities at local agencies. For example, the YMCA has organized a variety of activities using their facilities, and other organizations are providing outdoor gardening and outdoor living activities.

While students are getting real life experiences, the Vaile staff are meeting to discuss staff and student needs or are involved in staff development workshops. These building-level workshops cover a variety of topics, such as innovative teaching methods, motivating students, communicating with parents, and planning for success.

Program Improvement at John F. Nuner Elementary School, South Bend

A positive attitude toward change and the increased involvement of staff and parents are making a difference in the Chapter 1 program at Nuner Elementary School. Early in the school year, a PIP team was formed. This team consists of the school's principal, Chapter 1 resource teacher, two classroom teachers, and a parent of a current Chapter 1 student. Together, this team is involved in the process of diagnosing program and learner needs and of identifying changes with the greatest likelihood of increasing the achievement of Chapter 1 students.

With the support of the school principal, coordination of instruction is receiving more emphasis. Time and resources are provided on a regular basis for the classroom teacher to plan and coordinate instruction with the Chapter 1 staff. Once a month, during the school day, a substitute teacher releases classroom teachers for coordination time. Coordination of instruction is enhanced by two-way communication classroom teachers provide written information about students' instructional needs to the Chapter 1 teacher and paraprofessionals, and Chapter 1 staff provide written feedback to classroom teachers about students' progress. This cycle is ongoing.

The PIP Team is presently exploring the possibility of additional Chapter 1 assistance through an after-school program, beginning with the 1992-93 school year. To make more time available for learning, a model using regular classroom teachers and Chapter 1 paraprofessionals is under consideration. This model would focus on enrichment time for students with the greatest educational need.

The link between home and school is also growing stronger, as parents become more involved. Through the support of an active parent advisory council, workshops for parents focus on strategies to use at home to help their children succeed in school.

IOWA

Iowa

Chapter 1 Participation and Funding Summary

Participation Levels in School Year (SY) 1990-91

Number of Children Served:	40,699
Percentage of K-12 Children Served:	8%
Number and Percentage of School Districts Receiving Chapter 1 Assistance:	429; 100%
Number and Percentage of Schools Receiving Chapter 1 Assistance:	1,010; 100%

Chapter 1 Services by Grade Span in SY 1990-91

Preschool	1%
Kindergarten	5%
Grades 1-3	55%
Grades 4-6	32%
Grades 7-12	7%

State Funding Levels by School Year

Formula Grants Allocation SY 1990-91, 1991-92:	$39,469,513; $43,582,815
Formula Grants Allocation SY 1992-93:	$46,663,086
Chapter 1 Per Pupil Expenditure SY 1990-91:	$970
Program Improvement Allocation 1991-92, 1992-93:	$105,459; $180,000

Chapter 1 Program Improvement Summary

Number of Schools in Program Improvement in SY 1991-92

Total Number of Schools in Program Improvement:	93
Percentage of Chapter 1 Schools in Program Improvement:	9%
Number of Schools in Joint Planning:	0

Statewide Minimum Standards for Improvement–Zero normal curve equivalent (NCE) gains in basic and advanced skills.

Chapter 1 Program Improvement

Leveraging Accountability and Higher Performance

The Iowa Department of Education believes that it is impossible to be opposed to program improvement. Any program can be improved. Debatable issues such as criteria by which programs are to be judged, what are true program improvement strategies, and who is responsibile for program improvement do need attention, but should not detract from the value of the overall program improvement process.

Statewide Technical Assistance

Statewide technical assistance research suggests that each building within a district is unique and that for change to be positive, it must occur at this level. Thus, all the options that are a part of the plan to assist local education agencies (LEAs) with program improvement are focused at the building level.

The state Chapter 1 office has developed three options in response to anticipated LEA requests for assistance. The three options are team-training institutes, a self-evaluation instrument, and an on-site team review process.

All of these options have been based on the Effective Schools research, which identified thirteen characteristics or attributes that promote a positive learning climate. These thirteen characteristics have been reduced to the following six major areas for ease of use: program and staff leadership, curriculum and program design, school-classroom environment, classroom management; classroom instruction, and assessment and evaluation.

The self-evaluation instrument and the on-site interview questionnaires have been developed, field-tested, and revised for maximum effectiveness and usability. While there is no rigid order or sequence for use of the options, it is anticipated that the following approaches will be available: team-training institutes for those districts wishing to participate in an intensive process to develop their plan, self-evaluation instruments for any LEA that wishes to assess its Chapter 1 program and develop a plan based on its findings, and an on-site team review process for any LEA which might need additional assistance in developing or implementing an improvement plan.

In order to improve the development of advanced learning skills through Chapter 1 program improvement, the Iowa State Department of Education has focused on staff development. Key staff development activities supported by state administrative funds include:

- Workshops in problem solving and the use of manipulatives were conducted last fall in conjunction with the Technical Assistance Center (TAC) and Rural Technical Assistance Center (RTAC); these workshops are important because mathematics programs must be evaluated on the basis of problem solving;
- Workshops on strategies to help coordinate regular classroom and Chap-

ter 1 programs have been conducted in Area Education Associations (AEAs), and additional workshops are scheduled for this year.

- A workshop directed at teaching reading through writing was conducted for all Davenport Chapter 1-funded teachers and supervisors.: Additional AEAs requested this workshop but the SEA has been so over-extended that their requests had to be rejected.; and
- A two-day Chapter 1 program improvement institute to be conducted three times by the end of the year will have served approximately twenty-five LEAs.

Evaluations are conducted at the conclusion of each workshop. The reactions are highly favorable. The SEA Chapter 1 Coordinator states that, "I wouldn't even hazard a guess at how many times I have had comments such as—"This is great! Can you provide more workshops of this type?"

Educators hunger not only to be told that programs must improve, but also to be assisted in improving.

Educators hunger not only to be told that programs must improve, but also to be assisted in improving.

Exiting Program Improvement

Approximately 95 percent of the schools identified for Chapter 1 program improvement based on the 1989-90 testing cycle tested out of program improvement during the 1990-91 testing cycle. The SEA, however, requires schools that exit program improvement before fully implementing their plans to follow through with implementation.

Funding for Program Improvement

The SEA has distributed all of its 1990-91 program improvement funds. Because the SEA does not distribute such funds unless the LEA submits a program improvement plan, disbursement can take a considerable amount of time and distribution is sometimes slowed. Ninety-nine percent of the program improvement money is being used for mini-grants to LEAs rather than direct SEA technical assistance. Approximately 25 percent of Chapter 1 administration staff time is devoted to responsibilities for program improvement. All technical assistance in program improvement is supported by state administrative funds.

Some Chapter 1 administrative activities have been cut back due to increased attention devoted to program improvement. These include monitoring, newsletters, compliance workshops, and evaluation workshops. The SEA is working to coordinate Chapter 1 monitoring and compliance requirements with Chapter 1 program improvement goals.

Increasing Capacity for School Improvement

In order to improve the capacity of the Iowa State Department of Education to provide technical assistance to program improvement schools, the SEA recommends support for employment of non-administrative reading, mathematics, and early childhood specialists to work with identified schools, as well as borderline schools in a preventative mode.

Additional Chapter 1 Innovation and Reform

Schoolwide Projects

Number of schoolwide projects in Iowa by school year:

1989-90	1
1990-91	1
1991-92	1

Five schools in the state were eligible for Chapter 1 schoolwide projects in the 1990-91 school year. The SEA encourages the development and implementation of schoolwide projects by informing the LEAs their availability.

The SEA makes the following estimates of the number of schools that would be eligible for schoolwide projects if the low-income eligibility were reduced from 75 percent to the following levels: 20 schools at 60 percent, 69 schools at 50 percent, and 156 schools at 40 percent.

Statewide Coordination

Chapter 1 program improvement is serving as a framework to support state and local program improvement initiatives. Due to lack of adequate SEA Chapter 1 staff, however, efforts to coordinate Chapter 1 performance accountability provisions with other statewide accountability efforts have been slight.

Insufficient staffing has forced the SEA to limit the extent that it can coordinate Chapter 1 with Head Start, as well as with state and local preschool programs serving disadvantaged students. However, the SEA does encourage use of Chapter 1 funds for preschool and the early primary years in its conference presentations.

A request for proposals was sent to each LEA for programs to blend special education and Chapter 1 while maintaining the program integrities. The pilot projects are currently underway for 1992.

Making a Difference School by School

The SEA and the Chapter 1 RTAC are in the second year of a concentrated technical assistance effort in eight schools in six school districts. Seven of the eight schools were under no legal mandate to stay in program improvement after the first year of technical assistance. All, however, elected to continue into the second year. One of the school principals moved to another district at the end of the first year. He was, however, so pleased with his experience in the effort that he recruited two of his former teachers to assist him in making an unsolicited presentation at a recent state conference. The focus of the presentation was Chapter 1 program improvement strategies evolving out of the special project.

Kansas

Chapter 1 Participation and Funding Summary

Participation Levels in School Year (SY) 1990-91

Number of Children Served:	33,489
Percentage of K-12 Children Served:	7%
Number and Percentage of School Districts Receiving Chapter 1 Assistance:	302; 99%
Number and Percentage of Schools Receiving Chapter 1 Assistance:	739; 49%

Chapter 1 Services by Grade Span in SY 1990-91

Preschool	2%
Kindergarten	5%
Grades 1-3	46%
Grades 4-6	31%
Grades 7-12	16%

State Funding Levels by School Year

Formula Grants Allocation SY 1990-91, 1991-92:	$30,706,261; $35,668,400
Formula Grants Allocation SY 1992-93:	$39,781,859
Chapter 1 Per Pupil Expenditure SY 1990-91:	$896
Program Improvement Allocation SY 1991-92; 1992-93:	$97,671; $180,000

Chapter 1 Program Improvement Summary

Number of Schools in Program Improvement in SY 1991-92

Total Number of Schools in Program Improvement:	128
Percentage of Chapter 1 Schools in Program Improvement:	18%
Number of Schools in Joint Planning:	4

Statewide Minimum Standards for Improvement–A positive normal curve equivalent (NCE) gain, with at least 50 percent of the grades and the school as a whole with positive gains, and achievement of other locally determined desired outcomes which the state requires the districts to set.

Chapter 1 Program Improvement

Leveraging Accountability and Higher Performance

Program improvement has helped schools and districts identify weaknesses in their programs and has acted as a catalyst to improve the delivery of services schoolwide. By going through the process with school teams, Chapter 1 and non-Chapter 1 teachers and staff have better coordinated their strategies and efforts to increase success in the regular classroom.

Statewide Technical Assistance

The state education agency (SEA) has conducted numerous workshops for administrators and teachers on how to establish and write desired outcomes. Local education agencies (LEAs) must establish desired outcomes in their application and measure progress on results. Examples have also been developed and distributed to schools as requested.

For schools identified for program improvement, the SEA conducted five regional workshops for personnel to develop plans. Schools were required to send teams from each school to work through the process. These workshops were attended by 265 local administrators and teachers. The state also conducts in-service training sessions at nine different sites during the year to improve the skills of teachers. Teachers are provided college credit at six of the nine locations.

In order to reduce the negative association accompanying the identification of schools for program improvement, the SEA focused workshops on the improvement plan as being a school improvement plan rather than a Chapter 1 plan. The SEA requires that regular classroom teachers be a part of the program improvement planning committee and that they participate in the decision-making process regarding changes needed to improve student achievement.

Successful Models

In its visits to program improvement schools, the SEA staff has seen more Chapter 1 programs that have changed to pre-teaching instead of re-teaching. Chapter 1 students become familiar with the materials and lessons prior to introduction by the regular classroom teachers. Schools are also using more whole-language instruction, an integrated curriculum approach, and coordination of instruction based on student outcomes.

Exiting Program Improvement

Ninety-five percent of the schools identified for Chapter 1 program improvement based on the 1989-90 testing cycle tested out after the 1990-91 testing cycle. The SEA estimates that three-quarters of the schools that tested out did so due to partial implementation of plans. Most

schools continue the changes made through the program improvement process. The SEA has encouraged them to continue those successful activities that are not too costly. There are also several schools that developed plans even though they were not required to do so.

Joint SEA/LEA Plans

Schools required to develop joint plans are scheduled for on-site technical assistance by SEA staff. Staff reviews the LEA plan development process and evaluation data, visits with local Chapter 1 and regular classroom staff, and assists the local staff in making decisions on alternative strategies. All joint plan schools must attend a school improvement workshop sponsored by the state. The SEA staff will make recommendations in writing for activities to strengthen the program at joint improvement schools.

The SEA will in some cases target additional program improvement funds to joint plan schools. State administrative funds will be used for on-site assistance. The SEA has made recommendations related to replacement models, extended time, reduced time in laboratory programs, and staff development plans. It is too early in the process to measure the impact on student outcomes.

Funding for Program Improvement

All program improvement funds from 1990-91 have been distributed to local schools in the form of mini-grants to LEAs.

Approximately 20 percent of Chapter 1 state administrative staff time is spent on the program improvement process. All SEA technical assistance is supported by the state administrative funds. The SEA has decreased the amount of staff time spent on compliance monitoring. The same staff monitors programs and also works with schools on program improvement plans.

Increasing Capacity for School Improvement

Kansas schools need personnel to strengthen evaluation and testing to serve technical assistance needs of LEAs. The SEA also needs staff that can coordinate Chapter 1 improvement efforts with the Quality Performance Accreditation (QPA) process that will be required of all schools in the state by 1995. QPA-required school improvement plans, student plans, and state standards are being established to measure progress based on student outcome indicators. Curriculum specialists in the areas of reading and math could also be used to assist Chapter 1 local staff in implementing new math standards and new measurements for reading and writing.

Several different approaches are used in schoolwide projects such as reduction in class size, extended school year, use of bilingual paraprofessionals in all classrooms, computer-assisted-instruction, and more parent involvement activities.

The state has a separate application process for schoolwide projects. It requires responses to a series of questions based on the regulations and financial requirements.

The SEA has not had any schools become ineligible for schoolwide projects due to the maintenance of effort requirements. However, this could change under a new state finance formula currently being proposed. The SEA anticipates all schools will be able to meet the evaluation requirements. The SEA makes the following estimates of the number of schools that would be eligible for schoolwide projects if the low-income eligibility threshold were reduced from 75 percent to the following levels: 100 schools at 60 percent, 199 schools at 50 percent, and 409 schools at 40 percent.

The SEA requires that regular classroom teachers be a part of the program improvement planning committee and that they participate in the decision-making process regarding changes needed to improve student achievement.

Additional Chapter 1 Innovation and Reform

Schoolwide Projects

Number of schoolwide projects in Kansas by school year:

1989-90	2
1990-91	5
1991-92	8

In SY 1990-91, twenty-two Chapter 1 schools were eligible for schoolwide projects.

To encourage the development of schoolwide projects, the SEA has conducted schoolwide project activities during workshops. In some cases, schools find it too expensive to implement schoolwide projects.

The SEA has provided workshops and on-site technical assistance, and assisted in setting up visits to schoolwide projects in other states. Approximately twenty-five local staff members from Kansas schools attended the schoolwide project meeting in Texas in February 1992.

Coordination with the Regular Classroom

The Kansas SEA encourages coordination of Chapter 1 with regular classroom instruction. This topic is included in all state staff development and in-service activities. The state's application process also requires that the issue of coordinating Chapter 1 and regular classroom activities to better teach Chapter 1 children be addressed through regular and frequent meetings with all staff. It is also addressed in the program improvement planning process.

Statewide Coordination

As a statewide school improvement effort, Kansas is implementing its QPA system of accrediting schools based on student outcomes. The process will require schools to develop school profiles, a needs assessment process, an assessment model, student improvement plans, and other practices based on Effective Schools research and outcomes-based education. Chapter 1 program improvement will be integrated into the QPA process upon full implementation.

Kansas does not operate a state-sponsored compensatory education program similar to Chapter 1.

Chapter 1 funds are coordinated with other state funds such as the Parents As Teachers programs, at-risk grants, and locally funded preschool programs. A slight increase in the expenditure of Chapter 1 funds on preschool programs has been noted over the past few years. Guidance on coordination of these various programs is a featured topic at workshops and state effective school conferences and in newsletters distributed by the SEA. Information in the Chapter 1 Policy Manual about Chapter 1 coordination with these programs is also addressed at annually conducted administrative workshops.

When selecting limited-English-proficient (LEP) students for Chapter 1 services, Kansas uses the same criteria listed in the policy manual and coordinates joint funding activities with state funds. The SEA bilingual program staff is also under the supervision of the State Chapter 1 coordinator. Joint monitoring is conducted by Chapter 1 and bilingual staff to ensure compliance and effective use of funds.

The SEA currently has a cross-section committee that is working on a position paper on Chapter 1 and special education coordination and funding issues. The paper will be distributed to all LEAs this fiscal year.

To streamline the administrative requirements at the local level, SEA personnel annually review paperwork requirements and eliminate or modify forms as needed. The SEA also must have all forms approved through an internal process to avoid duplication with other programs or data-collection requirements.

Making a Difference School by School

Schoolwide Project at New Stanley, Kansas City

The objective of New Stanley is simple — all students achieve and succeed. One hundred percent of students who exit at the end of six years will be at or above grade level. By committing whatever resources are necessary, the school district will guarantee this achievement level for all students who have attended New Stanley for four or more years. An accompanying and related objective is that all students will feel good about themselves and their involvement with New Stanley.

To accomplish this objective, the program will be an entirely integrated approach founded on: (1) high expectations for all students; (2) enhancement of all students' self-esteem; and (3) emphasis on social and multi-cultural curriculum.

Extensive and continuous staff development to raise expectations will focus on the work of Tom Good at the University of Missouri, the Effective Schools research, and the work being conducted by Jeff Howard at the Efficacy Institute in Lexington, Massachusetts. Dr. Howard will be used as a primary resource to establish high expectations for minority and low-income students. Briefly stated, his application of attribution theory holds that all children have the ability to learn and to achieve at high levels when schools develop in children the internal belief that their success is controlled by their own effort.

Technology will play an integral role at New Stanley in the areas of student instruction, teacher planning, building management, and the monitoring of student achievement. At New Stanley, the computer will be viewed as a basic tool in doing the business of teaching. Specifically, computers will not be add-ons to the instructional program, but integral tools in the teaching-learning process. A networked 24-station computer lab will be available for learning keyboarding and writing with a word processor. Each team of teachers will have twelve student computers to use as a part of instruction in all curricular areas. Software will be provided for use in the areas of problem solving, database management, simulation, and word processing.

Teachers will have access to computers both in the classroom and in the teacher work area. Teachers will use computers to monitor student progress on outcomes, generate students' materials, plan lessons and units, and produce students and parent communications.

Kentucky

Chapter 1 Participation and Funding Summary

Participation Levels in School Year (SY) 1990-91

Number of Children Served:	97,876
Percentage of K-12 Children Served:	16%
Number and Percentage of School Districts Receiving Chapter 1 Assistance:	99%
Number and Percentage of Schools Receiving Chapter 1 Assistance:	960; 70%

Chapter 1 Services by Grade Span in SY 1990-91

Preschool	<1%
Kindergarten	4%
Grades 1-3	40%
Grades 4-6	36%
Grades 7-12	20%

State Funding Levels by School Year

Formula Grants Allocation SY 1990-91, 1991-92:	$85,951,394; $100,669,520
Formula Grants Allocation SY 1992-93:	$110,704,511
Chapter 1 Per Pupil Expenditure SY 1990-91:	$878
Program Improvement Allocation SY 1991-92; 1992-93:	$246,172; $411,774

Chapter 1 Program Improvement Summary

Number of Schools in Program Improvement in SY 1991-92

Total Number of Schools in Program Improvement:	271
Percentage of Chapter 1 Schools in Program Improvement:	26%
Number of Schools in Joint Planning:	12

Statewide Minimum Standards for Improvement–A gain of at least one normal curve equivalent (NCE) in both basic and advanced skills and substantial progress in meeting two of the three required desired outcomes for each instructional area addressed in a school.

Chapter 1 Program Improvement

Leveraging Accountability and Higher Performance

The Kentucky Department of Education strongly supports the Chapter 1 school improvement concept in conjunction with the Kentucky Education Reform Act (KERA). KERA has established performance standards and "Valued Outcomes" that all students will be expected to master at threshold levels. Reporting gains in NCEs, however, is a problematic area since Kentucky will not be using norm-referenced testing and is discouraging local education agencies (LEAs) from using normed testing. Accordingly, Chapter 1 personnel at the state education agency (SEA) are exploring new ways to integrate the required evaluation criteria for Chapter 1 and the state-required evaluation criteria.

Statewide Technical Assistance

The SEA encourages schools with Chapter 1 programs to set goals and assess performance using objective data such as criterion-referenced tests, publisher-made tests or teacher-made tests. The SEA believes that success can and should be measured using a variety of methods. The Committee of Practitioners has also encouraged the establishment of desired outcomes that are measured through means other than in NCEs.

The SEA is helping schools establish effective locally determined desired outcomes through a variety of strategies. Many of the LEAs are in the Kentucky Effective Schools initiative under Chapter 2 and the data collected there can easily be disaggregated for Chapter 1 children. This data disaggregation gives the LEA significant indicators for the development of desired outcomes and coordination with the regular program of the school. Regional workshops are held annually for district teams to enhance their understanding of Chapter 1 program delivery and desired outcomes as an outgrowth of identified needs.

The SEA emphasizes desired outcomes at all regional and state meetings held by the SEA, regional service centers and educational cooperatives. The Effective Schools consultant who works with the action committee at identified schools communicates directly with the committee to help them understand how desired outcomes are determined and how their students will be evaluated relative to each outcome. Specific forms and directions for writing the desired outcomes are shared with each LEA. Current training for local schools and districts focuses on both connecting the Chapter 1 desired outcomes with the "Valued Outcomes" outlined in KERA and reflecting the identified needs of participating students.

Once identified for program improvement, the school is given technical assistance by the SEA primarily through the Effective Schools consultant working with building-level action committees. These workshops focus on the establish-

ment of a philosophy and purpose of Chapter 1, coordination with KERA and an Effective Schools Project, designing a Chapter 1 project from a comprehensive needs assessment and student selection process, evaluation criteria, coordination relative to curriculum; instruction, communication, leadership and home-school partnership, student improvement and school improvement process based on the Effective Schools model, instructional program designs, and learning styles inventories.

The approach that the SEA has taken to reduce any potential negative association at the local level accompanying identification for program improvement has been to involve all of the stakeholders in the process. An action committee is formed at each identified school; it includes the local coordinator, building level principal, regular classroom teachers, Chapter 1 teachers and/or instructional assistants, and parents of participating Chapter 1 students. The Effective Schools consultant then meets with the committee to answer site specific questions and offer assistance which could include guiding the committee members through the improvement process or connecting the committee with other providers. Communication, coordination and cooperation are emphasized throughout the process. The Effective Schools consultant communicates directly with the local superintendent and board members as requested. Program improvement has become such a positive agent for change that some schools undergo the process on their own without being officially identified.

Increased emphasis on the development of advanced skills and adoption of successful models has been a key focus area for the SEA. Workshops by SEA personnel and the Indianapolis Technical Assistance Center for districts and schools requesting assistance have been particularly effective. New printed materials have been developed and disseminated to LEAs and extensive follow-up relative to curriculum alignment in the five advanced skills outlined in Chapter 1 law has been done. KERA has assisted Chapter 1 significantly in the area of delivery of services in the most appropriate setting for the child. Integration of services is a vital part of KERA.

Successful Models

The SEA is beginning to view greater variety in the models for curriculum, instructional strategies, and coordination with the regular program. The curriculum in Kentucky schools is becoming less prescriptive and more responsive through multiple vehicles. Specific instructional strategies to address the needs of students served in Chapter 1 are more accurately identified. Learning and reading style inventories are used along with teacher discussion groups to identify the learning strengths and weaknesses of children. Substitutes are employed periodically so that Chapter 1 and regular classroom teachers can have professional time to discuss specific learning needs of children. Besides determining what strategies to use in each setting, collaboration improves coordination with the regular program as evidenced by regular and Chapter 1 teachers sharing lesson plans on a weekly basis. Chapter 1 teachers and administrators ensure that the Chapter 1 curriculum is an integral part of the district curriculum. High expectations have been set for all students.

Exiting Program Improvement

Based on the 1989-90 testing cycle approximately 24 percent of the total schools identified for improvement improved scores and exited program improvement during the 1990-91 testing cycle. The Kentucky Department of Education staff believes that implementation, even if not complete, caused schools to focus on the needs of participating Chapter 1 students and improve scores at least in the short term. Since real change takes longer to manifest itself, the most telling evaluation is whether the gains in schools that only partially implemented plans are maintained over time.

The SEA encourages schools to continue in program improvement even though their plans were not fully implemented. One of the timeline options given to schools allows them to begin planning and implementation during the second semester. If at the end of the spring semester, the school evaluation results meet minimum requirements, the school chooses whether or not to continue in the process. If the former choice is made, the state supports the effort with program improvement grant monies and technical assistance. Since real change takes time, this process actually gives the school two full years to improve.

Joint SEA/LEA Plans

The method used by the SEA to establish joint plans with LEAs is similar to that used to establish first-year plans. Due to the positive relationship established between the state and the LEA during the year one plan, the joint plan is viewed as an extension and fine tuning. In Kentucky, the SEA uses the Effective Schools process and recognizes that real change in a school takes several years. In most cases, the school personnel know best what needs to be done to meet the needs of their students. The role of the state is to continue working with the school's action committee as either a resource for direct assistance or conduit to other providers. Similar to year one schools, joint plan schools rely primarily on the Effective Schools consultant for technical assistance. Program improvement funds are also allocated to joint plan schools using a weighted formula. Some activities which have been very effective in raising achievement include the disaggregation of school data through the Effective Schools process and coordination with the regular program via joint training sessions on instructional strategies and planning.

Funding for Program Improvement

Approximately 96 percent of the program improvement funds have been allocated to date. All of the program improvement monies are used for minigrants to schools identified for Chapter 1 program improvement. The paperwork generated by the large increase in schools identified and the requirement that each one must submit a budget has considerably slowed implementation of the plans.

State administrative staff time devoted to program improvement has increased significantly during the past three years. Each Chapter 1 program consultant spends approximately 25 percent of his or her time on program improvement issues. The Effective Schools consultant spends 100 percent of his time on Chapter 1 Program Improvement. Without increased state administration funds, services to LEAs will need to be scaled back considerably, thus affecting the quality and quantity of service to students served in the Chapter 1 programs. Monitoring and on-site observation by program consultants are activities that have been cut back as program improvement responsibilities have increased.

Increasing Capacity for School Improvement

As a national leader in educational transformation, the Kentucky Department of Education has stated that its mission is to ensure that each child receive an internationally superior education and a love of learning through visionary leadership, vigorous stewardship, and exemplary services in alliance with schools, school districts, and other partners.

The SEA is woefully understaffed to meet the needs of the local schools relative to the mission statement. More administrative funds are needed to meet the data collection needs at the state level. More time should be spent delivering direct services to schools and districts. The current funding level for program improvement is much too low to support the initiatives that identified schools need to implement. In conjunction with Chapter 1 accountability at the building level, the reform act in Kentucky also places accountability at each school. Coordination and cooperation between Chapter 1 and KERA is crucial. Additional funds could be used to expand the needed training for teachers in identified schools in the areas of cooperative learning, identification of learning needs and appropriate strategies to meet these needs, integration of Chapter 1 services with the regular program, and team building.

Program improvement has become such a positive agent for change that some schools undergo the process on their own without being officially identified.

Additional Chapter 1 Innovation and Reform

Schoolwide Projects

Number of schoolwide projects in Kentucky over the last three school years:

1989-90	14
1990-91	35
1991-92	80

According to the State Department of Education, 145 Chapter 1 schools were eligible for schoolwide projects in 1990-91.

To encourage the development and implementation of schoolwide projects in the state, the SEA describes the schoolwide project as an alternative model of service delivery to all district Chapter 1 coordinators and principals at regional meetings and in a resource guide. The SEA also stresses the coordination of schoolwide projects with KERA and with program improvement.

The SEA provides technical assistance to schools planning and implementing schoolwide projects. One state education program consultant is available to facilitate the planning of the project at the school level. The Indianapolis Technical Assistance Center, the state of West Virginia, and Kentucky annually host a schoolwide project conference for those schools in the planning stages and for those already implementing projects. Conference participants have the opportunity to visit on-site and interact with practitioners from active schoolwide projects. Ongoing technical assistance in effective instructional practices, organizing and scheduling for instruction, and curriculum development is available from the SEA and the Indianapolis Technical Assistance Center.

Changes in curriculum, instruction, and organization have been undertaken in schools through schoolwide projects. To implement KERA, many schoolwide projects are integrating reading, writing, and language into blocks with content area subjects. By emphasizing thinking skills, instruction on basic skills is embedded in the context of complex, meaningful tasks in all areas of instruction. Teachers apply interactive instructional strategies that allow students to monitor and adjust as they learn. Multiple measures to assess student growth are interwoven with instruction.

The SEA monitors the schoolwide project and program improvement plans to assure that they are aligned. About 20 percent of the eighty schoolwide projects have been identified for program improvement, and only two of the schoolwide projects are in joint planning. The SEA is working closely with those schools identified for program improvement to assure that they meet the performance requirements for third-year accountability.

The SEA makes the following estimates of the number of schools that would be eligible for schoolwide projects if the low-income eligibility threshold

were reduced from 75 percent to the following levels: 285 schools at 60 percent, 410 schools at 50 percent, and 565 schools at 40 percent.

Coordination with the Regular Classroom

By encouraging LEAs to coordinate Chapter 1 with the regular program, Chapter 1 is an active partner in the reform of Kentucky education. In regional meetings held in the spring of 1991 with district Chapter 1 coordinators and school principals, the SEA presented a variety of instructional models for delivery of Chapter 1 services as well as information on how Chapter 1 can supplement areas of the Kentucky Education Reform Act. The SEA encourages LEAs to include principals, classroom and Chapter 1 staff, and parents in the ongoing process of improving the Chapter 1 program.

Training in effective instruction for educationally deprived students based on research such as "Better Schooling for Children of Poverty" and "Teaching Advanced Skills to Educationally Disadvantaged Students" is provided to both classroom and Chapter 1 staff. The regional meetings held this spring for district teams consisting of Chapter 1 coordinators, regular instructional supervisors, principals, and classroom and Chapter 1 staff focused on making Chapter 1 an active partner in KERA.

Statewide Coordination

Chapter 1 program improvement is closely aligned with the state school improvement initiative. Both the state and Chapter 1 improvement models are based on the Effective Schools Model outlined by Lezotte and Edmonds. Chapter 1 program improvement is housed in the Office of Intervention and Assistance with the Division of School Improvement. This Division coordinates all the state and federally mandated improvement initiatives. The integration of each initiative into a coherent, outcomes-based process to meet expectations is reviewed regularly. Plans developed through any of the initiatives are interchangeable with only slight modification and expanded focus on a particular characteristic or sub-group of children.

The SEA coordinates Chapter 1 program improvement with other state and federal school improvement programs. A Chapter 1 staff person with the responsibility for program improvement works in the Kentucky Department of Education Division for School Improvement.

The SEA also operates a state-sponsored compensatory education program which targets educationally disadvantaged students. The Extended School Services (ESS) program is based on extending the instructional day for disadvantaged students; before- and after-school and summer school programs are the common delivery options under the new KERA program. Kentucky also had the State Remediation Program, which provides supplemental instruction to SEA-identified educationally disadvantaged children; however, the program has been terminated under KERA. The ESS program is in its first year of implementation and coordination activities have been limited to supplementing summer programs. Due to the recent total reorganization under KERA, ESS staff and Chapter 1 staff are located in different divisions. Although the goals of ESS and Chapter 1 are similar and both programs require monitoring, a procedure for coordination has not been fully established. Applications for ESS and Chapter 1 funds are separate and the process of coordination has been temporarily hindered by the myriad of change accompanying implementation of KERA.

In an effort to reduce administrative paperwork, the SEA staff reviews and streamlines required paperwork where possible. Last year, for example, the length of the grant application was reduced by 20 percent.

Efforts to coordinate Chapter 1 with Head Start and local preschool programs were addressed by SEA Chapter 1 staff presenting information on appropriate services for preschool students during annual, statewide and regional meetings. As a result, several districts have developed Chapter 1 funded preschool programs.

The SEA Chapter 1 staff annually conduct statewide regional meetings for LEAs; they provide current information concerning the coordination of Chapter 1, ESS, special education and bilingual education funds. In addition, the SEA staff periodically distributes letters of information and policy updates.

Limited English proficient (LEP) students make up less than 1 percent of the student population in Kentucky. With such small numbers and the adequate guidance presented by the federal policy manual, the need for further SEA guidance has been unnecessary.

The SEA Chapter 1 staff maintains ongoing communication with state and local personnel dealing with exceptional children to ensure that special education students with mild disabilities are not excluded from services.

Making a Difference School by School

Schoolwide Project at Majestic-Knox Elementary School, Pike County

Majestic-Knox is beginning its first year as a schoolwide project. The staff at the school totally restructured their school curriculum, organization, and instruction. Advanced skills in reading and math are emphasized and social studies and science are integrated with these subjects. The basic organization for instruction is based on the Teaching and Learning with Computers (TLC) approach, which allows cooperative and active learning by students, flexibility to meet individual needs, and an emphasis on independent learning strategies. Writing is used extensively in research using trade books, encyclopedias, and dictionaries. Staffing patterns have been adjusted so that the pupil-teacher ratio is 15 to 1 with students grouped heterogeneously into an ungraded program throughout the school. In the primary program, first- and second-year students

and third- and fourth-year students are taught together. The intermediate program is also ungraded with 4th, 5th, and 6th grade students working together. One of the Chapter 1-funded teachers also serves as a resource to assist other teachers in the use of the computer lab. By abandoning their reliance on the basal text (and, in fact, all textbooks), the teachers continually adjust the instruction to meet the needs of their students, particularly the educationally deprived student.

As a part of the schoolwide project plan, a counselor and parent liaison were added to the school. With the principal, the counselor assists teachers in making needed adjustments in the organization of the project. Both the principal and counselor assist teachers in finding appropriate training to implement their instructional program. Program improvement funds were used to provide training. The counselor also works with teachers and parents on improving student attendance and meeting the social needs of students. The parent liaison has started a parent resource room where parents assist teachers with such activities as cutting out bulletin board characters. The parents are currently being trained to use the computer programs their children utilize. In this way, the parents will feel comfortable in reinforcing their own children's learning at home as well as assisting other children at school with the computer programs.

At Majestic-Knox Elementary School, the principal, counselor, teachers and parents have formed a team to transform their school into an environment where all children are not only expected to learn but are allowed to learn. State, local, Chapter 1 and program improvement funds are used to support this environment.

Program Improvement at Jackson Elementary, Jackson

Jackson Elementary is located in the county seat of Breathitt County, Kentucky. This small independent district offers a surprisingly fresh and innovative approach to educating children. Faced with overwhelming poverty and unemployment, Jackson Elementary has depended on caring, innovative teachers to meet the needs of children. Program improvement under Chapter 1 has afforded them an opportunity to more accurately address some of the identified needs.

The action committee arranged a common planning time for regular and Chapter 1 teachers to meet and develop an instructional program to meet the needs of each child served in Chapter 1. Visits have been made to other schools with exemplary Chapter 1 programs to learn new and different approaches to program delivery and instructional strategies. Parent newsletters, PTA discussions, an open-house, and local newspaper articles have significantly raised the community awareness relative to the purpose and expectations of the Chapter 1 program. As areas of need are identified, curriculum and instructional modifications are employed. Cooperative learning methodologies have been very successfully used by the teachers, specially as Learning Styles Inventory results have been studied. The "Writing to Read" and "Teaching and Learning with Computers" programs have also been very beneficial.

Louisiana

Chapter 1 Participation and Funding Summary

Participation Levels in School Year (SY) 1990-91

Number of Children Served:	108,791
Percentage of K-12 Children Served:	14%
Number and Percentage of School Districts Receiving Chapter 1 Assistance:	66; 100%
Number and Percentage of Schools Receiving Chapter 1 Assistance:	830; 56%

Chapter 1 Services by Grade Span in SY 1990-91

Preschool	4%
Kindergarten	14%
Grades 1-3	49%
Grades 4-6	28%
Grades 7-12	5%

State Funding Levels by School Year

Formula Grants Allocation SY 1990-91, 1991-92:	$115,032,505; $134,603,713
Formula Grants Allocation SY 1992-93:	$148,077,276
Chapter 1 Per Pupil Expenditure SY 1990-91:	$840
Program Improvement Allocation SY 1991-92; 1992-93:	$327,864; $545,690

Chapter 1 Program Improvement Summary

Number of Schools in Program Improvement in SY 1991-92

Total Number of Schools in Program Improvement:	310
Percentage of Chapter 1 Schools in Program Improvement:	37%
Number of Schools in Joint Planning:	38

Statewide Minimum Standards for Improvement–Greater than zero normal curve equivalent (NCE) gain in basic and advanced skills for grade 2-12 programs and substantial progress in achieving locally determined desired outcomes for pre-kindergarten, kindergarten, and 1st grade, as well as grades 2-12.

Chapter 1 Program Improvement

Leveraging Accountability and Higher Performance

The state education agency (SEA) staff has promoted program improvement as a positive opportunity that actually extends the overall program improvement effort in which local education agencies (LEAs) have been engaged for many years. At statewide federal program administrators' meetings, the SEA has continued to refer to program improvement in positive terms— a "window of opportunity." The Louisiana Association of Elementary School Principals' Conference has also been used as a vehicle to proactively approach program improvement.

However, positive exhortations do not always bring about change. The project application requirements are being used as a lever to raise NCE standards, for most LEAs, to at least one NCE for school year 1992-93. The SEA has met regionally with LEAs throughout the state to convey the need for higher levels of accountability. Approval of the project is contingent upon higher aggregate performance standards. The Committee of Practioners (COP) tends to lean toward the flexibility of the zero NCE gain score as the minimum standard.

The requirement to use NCE gains on standardized tests is discouraging the use of other desired outcomes. The LEAs feel that no matter how well they perform on other measures, the NCE aggregate performance drives the school identification process.

Statewide Technical Assistance

Schools identified for local program improvement may participate in program improvement training designed by the state Technical Assistance Center (TAC) and held at regional locations. Staff consult with local coordinators to identify strategies for improvement, facilitate school improvement teams, provide staff development, respond to proposed plans, provide resource materials, and assist in implementation upon request. Schools are able to request program improvement funds using a formula that provides a base funding sum and additional money for a larger number of participants.

At the regional training meetings, information was disseminated on program models that emphasized advanced skills, including Higher Order Thinking Skills (HOTS), Accelerated Schools, and Reading Recovery/Rescue. Additionally, a directory of National Diffusion Network (NDN) programs in the state was distributed.

Successful Models

The models most frequently embraced by schools in Chapter 1 program improvement are the following: cooperative learning, whole-language strategies,

strategies for learning disabled, computer-assisted instruction, take home computers for parents, increased holdings of children's literature, and staff development for entire faculties in schools.

Exiting Program Improvement

Of the ninety schools identified for Chapter 1 program improvement in the 1989-90 testing cycle, eighteen schools, or 20 percent, tested out. These schools improved their aggregate performance mainly because of the awareness factors that bring about subtle changes in program implementation, and to a lesser extent, because of the normal fluctuations in standardized testing results.

The SEA encourages schools that are eligible to exit program improvement to continue in the program improvement process at regional training meetings, and also by awarding schools with an incentive grant if they voluntarily implement the plan.

Joint SEA/LEA Projects

Educators from schools that needed to develop joint plans with the state were required to attend a two-day workshop in September to introduce strategies for refining the program improvement process. Topics covered in the session included developing a school profile, assessing their program on the ten attributes of effective programs, and disaggregating data in order to assess causes related to lack of academic progress.

The TAC, Rural Technical Assistance Center (RTAC), and SEA staffs were involved in the sessions, and the SEA staff consulted with individual schools to assess the previous year's plan. Two months later, SEA and TAC/RTAC staff made on-site visits to the schools to consult with the school teams on the development of the joint plan. Additionally, the SEA offered technical assistance to the central office staff. The SEA will review and provide feedback on the completed plans before the school sends them to the local school board and the COP for approval.

Schools in joint planning were given a planning grant of $500 to fund things such as substitute teachers, travel to model sites, and stipends for after-school meetings. Program improvement funds are being used to pay for the planning grants and for subsequent joint implementation grants. The LEA's basic grant will also be available to fund parts of the joint plan. The first round of joint plans was developed during spring 1992.

Funding for Program Improvement

Approximately 96 percent of the program improvement money is being used for mini-grants to LEAs. In addition, approximately 55 percent of state Chapter 1 administration staff time is devoted to responsibilities for program improvement. About 90 percent of state technical assistance in program improvement is supported by state administrative funds. Program compliance audits and staff development have been cut back as the result of increased attention devoted to program improvement.

Increasing Capacity for School Improvement

Data management and trained SEA staff are a critical need for the Louisiana SEA. The lack of effective data management is apparent at the local level and escalates at the state level where the numbers are processed. There are inadequate resources, staff, data capacity, and software systems to accommodate the information needed to make informed school improvement decisions in a timely manner. Staff development is essential to increase SEA capacity to assist in the areas of data disaggregation, management, strategy awareness, testing, learner outcomes, and instructional leadership.

Additional Chapter 1 Innovation and Reform

Schoolwide Projects

Number of schoolwide projects in Louisiana by school year:

1989-90	12
1990-91	12
1991-92	15

In 1990-91, 204 schools were eligible for schoolwide projects.

The SEA encourages the development of schoolwide projects through presentations at statewide conferences. In addition, the SEA provides on-site visits, along with consultation with Chapter 1 directors and principals to assist in the development of schoolwide improvement plans.

Schoolwide projects have expanded the use of technology to enable teachers to present information in numerous formats, to reduce class size, and to make other positive changes.

In order to foster the development of schoolwide plans that will support significant improvement in programs, Louisiana requires one year of preplanning before approving schoolwide projects. The SEA makes the following estimates of the number of schools that would be eligible for schoolwide projects if the low-income eligibility threshold were reduced from 75 percent to the following levels: 464 schools at 60 percent, 684 schools at 50 percent, and 786 schools at 40 percent.

The state education agency staff has promoted program improvement as a positive opportunity that actually extends the overall program improvement effort in which local education agencies have been engaged for many years.

Coordination with the Regular Classroom

The SEA is encouraging LEAs to use the school district's school improvement planning process and procedures to address particular Chapter 1 program improvement needs. The same planning document can be used to outline improvement activities.

Several statewide efforts have been undertaken to help train Chapter 1 and regular classroom teachers to better teach Chapter 1 children in the regular classroom. A literacy institute was hosted and largely underwritten by Chapter 1 basic grant and program improvement incentive grants. This training opportunity was extended to Chapter 1 and regular teachers in June 1991.

In September 1990, there was a statewide Chapter 1 conference that focused on issues of coordination and innovative programs and strategies. All Chapter 1 staff and some regular program staff attended. Last October, Chapter 1 worked with an early childhood association, LACUS, to provide training opportunities for all Chapter 1 preschool teachers and other preschool teachers in the area of developmentally-appropriate practices.

Statewide Coordination

Louisiana has an accountability framework that encourages schools to take the results from the School Progress Profile (report card) and make attempts to improve specific areas. Schoolwide program improvement plans are not mandated at this time. Chapter 1 program improvement uses the School Progress Profile as part of the assessment of schools' strengths and needs. If a school district does require school-based planning for improvement, the Chapter 1 program improvement process dovetails the district's procedures and format.

Chapter 1 program improvement is coordinating with Chapter 2 in several ways. The School Effectiveness Training offered by Chapter 2 has provided training to several SEA Chapter 1 staff members and many LEA Chapter 1 staff members. The schools in the Effectiveness Project are in many cases also identified for Chapter 1 program improvement and given special technical assistance by the regional service centers.

The Chapter 1 SEA staff is converting some of the reporting requirements into checklist formats to expedite reporting of program improvement status. The Chapter 1 Information Management Program has been used by most of the LEAs to compile data for evaluation and program improvement.

The SEA supports the use of Chapter 1 funds for preschool programs and encourages LEAs to consider the use of this early intervention strategy to improve the Chapter 1 program. Chapter 1 SEA staff is involved with facilitating the Early Childhood Study Commission, which is charged with working to accomplish the preschool initiative of National Goal 1. Head Start, private day care, church-based programs, state-supported programs for four-year-olds, child advocates, other state agencies, and universities are collaborating in this project.

The state has encouraged LEAs to coordinate the various supplemental programs to the extent that the Chapter 1 dollars are still focused on serving the students who are eligible for Chapter 1.

In many cases, children with mild disabilities and characteristics similar to Chapter 1 children are not being served by special education because of placement restrictions requiring the demonstration of at least one strength. There are some instances where Chapter 1 services are integrated into an inclusive instructional program.

Making a Difference School by School

Program Improvement at Sicily Island Elementary, Catahoula Parish

To begin the program improvement process, the Facilitation Committee at Sicily Island Elementary reviewed a number of evaluations and assessment reports to develop a composite of the school's entire instructional program. The following significant findings were reported: the school has a very disadvantaged population as evidenced by the 85 percent free/reduced lunch rate, the 49 percent eligibility for Chapter 1, and the 15 percent unemployment rate experienced by the parish over the past five years.

Phase two of the program improvement process called for the identification of strengths and weaknesses of the instructional program at the school. Identified strengths included a low teacher/student ratio, high student attendance (95%), effective staff development, and adequate Chapter 1 instructional time. The identified target areas included the need for more parental involvement and training in the use of print and other supplementary materials and the need to diversify the Chapter 1 instruction to include additional literature-based materials, multi-sensory techniques, and innovative comprehensive procedures.

From phase three of the program improvement process emerged the resulting Chapter 1 program improvement plan to address the diagnosed needs. Steps of this plan include: creating a Parent Resource Center from which parents can borrow materials such as trade books, read-alongs, and computers; strengthening communication between parents and teachers through home visits by a Parent Recruiter; instituting a year-long reading stimulus for parents and students; devising a schedule for members of the community to read in the Chapter 1 classroom; and scheduling parent training sessions on helping children learn to read.

Chapter 1 teachers participated in a literacy conference and shared innovative techniques with the rest of the school staff. The school also incorporated literature-based materials and modes of instruction into the classroom and emphasized multi-sensory instruction.

The result of this program improvement plan has been more knowledgeable instructional personnel who are dedicated to providing improved instruction to students whose only hope for a better life often rests with what school, and particularly Chapter 1, provides them.

Schoolwide Project at Lockett Elementary, Orleans Parish School System

Lockett is a schoolwide project that has implemented an extended school year. Following the Japanese model, Lockett added 40 days, for a total of 220 school days. It is hoped that the regression that pupils commonly experience during the summer months will be eliminated and that yearly growth will be enhanced.

Chapter 1 funds 19 percent of the teaching staff, which includes special education, while the general funds pays for support personnel, materials, supplies, overhead, and food.

Maine

Chapter 1 Participation and Funding Summary

Participation Levels in School Year (SY) 1990-91

Number of Children Served:	26,288
Percentage of K-12 Children Served:	12%
Number and Percentage of School Districts Receiving Chapter 1 Assistance:	181; 99%
Number and Percentage of Schools Receiving Chapter 1 Assistance:	548; 73%

Chapter 1 Services by Grade Span in SY 1990-91

Preschool	2%
Kindergarten	10%
Grades 1-3	46%
Grades 4-6	29%
Grades 7-12	13%

State Funding Levels by School Year

Formula Grants Allocation SY 1990-91, 1991-92:	$22,896,996; $27,642,168
Formula Grants Allocation SY 1992-93:	$32,384,592
Chapter 1 Per Pupil Expenditure SY 1990-91:	$1,018
Program Improvement Allocation SY 1991-92, 1992-93:	$90,000; $180,000

Chapter 1 Program Improvement Summary

Number of Schools in Program Improvement in SY 1991-92

Total Number of Schools in Program Improvement:	165
Percentage of Chapter 1 Schools in Program Improvement:	30%
Number of Schools in Joint Planning:	6

Statewide Minimum Standards for Improvement: –At least one normal curve equivalent (NCE) gain in basic and advanced skills for grade 2-12 programs and substantial progress in achieving locally determined desired outcomes required for schools having pre school, kindergarten, or 1st grade programs.

Chapter 1 Program Improvement

Leveraging Accountability and Higher Performance

Because of the program improvement initiative, Chapter 1 has become the driving force in the development of performance assessment and curriculum within the state. Coordination and cooperation previously lacking is now possible. Chapter 1 was previously considered separate from the regular school program, thus weakening its potential.

The statewide minimum aggregate standard has been increased from a standard of any gain greater than zero NCE in 1989-90 and 1990-91 to the current standard of one NCE gain. However, the Committee of Practitioners (COP), and local education agency (LEA) representatives have found use of standardized testing in the evaluation of Chapter 1 programs a thorny issue in Maine. Schools would prefer evaluation tools similar to the Maine Assessment of Educational Progress or the use of portfolios. These appear to be more credible and seem to relate more closely to true performance in regular classroom settings. Research recognizes the limitations of and difficulties in using these measures for analytical purposes. The state education agency (SEA) is therefore working to assist LEAs in the development of other desired outcomes for grades 2-12. The ultimate goal is for these to lend themselves to norming.

LEAs have in fact expressed great interest in the other desired outcomes categories. The SEA is working with interested and qualifying LEAs through on-site technical assistance, regional and local inservice training, specialized consulting support from the state, and pairing weak district programs with those proven to be successful. This assistance is designed to build on what is already in place and advance the state's education philosophy as set forth in the Maine Common Core of Learning.

Statewide Technical Assistance

Technical assistance in setting other desired outcomes includes collaborative work with other department units responsible for curriculum, assessment, early childhood education, special education, and drop-out prevention. RMC Research, the Region 1 Technical Assistance Center (TAC), has been instrumental in providing much of the support requested by the LEAs.

Assistance in setting outcome goals is also provided by the SEA at program improvement workshops, on-site in-service, and program reviews. Efforts are made to team up districts that are planning similar programs. The SEA also provides information through consultants in divisions other than Chapter 1, such as curriculum, early childhood, and assessment.

The use of any one measure to identify accurately the success of the Chapter

1 program is not ideal. While there is concern about the merit of standardized tests, Maine LEAs have expressed great interest in learning as much as possible from the results. They use the information for design, planning, and as an indicator of how their students compare on a national basis, as well as how they are progressing within the discrete goals of the curriculum.

Once identified for improvement, schools receive technical assistance provided by the SEA, such as information on promising programs and practices like Reading Recovery and Higher Order Thinking Skills (H0TS). LEAs requested and received support and training for both their certified teachers and paraprofessional staff on the following topics: instruction in advanced skills, teaching to the new math standards, early childhood practices, evaluation options, and parental involvement.

Program improvement in Maine is always approached in a positive and supportive way. The process begins with informational sessions presented at administrative meetings. Additional assistance is available through workshops on developing the plan and on-site consultation. Surveys of need are distributed, and the information gathered from them is used to plan informational sessions. Such open communication is the key to success.

It is important to note that LEA representatives welcome the process but are at times frustrated with it. Coordinators found themselves in the position of being required to develop program improvement plans when they were unsure as to what activities would make a difference. Therefore, a document was distributed that summarized some key principles and strategies for developing a Chapter 1 program improvement plan. Program coordinators have been encouraged to use it as a guideline, not as a set of directions.

It is extremely difficult to improve a single component of a Chapter 1 project in isolation. It has therefore become necessary for program improvement to include locally funded administrators, teachers, and Chapter 1 parents, as well as the Chapter 1 staff. Communication and coordination have been greatly enhanced through this process and results of the in-service activities are evident when visiting these schools. LEA representatives were encouraged to attend the informational sessions as a team, but understanding that this was not always possible, the Maine SEA provided handouts for participants to take back to their schools to share with their colleagues. Because of this sharing, coupled with other state initiatives, local Chapter 1 staff members appear to be exercising a larger role in district planning. Chapter 1 staff has become an integral part of the Maine Common Core of Learning, school restructuring, curriculum committees, and so on.

To better serve the program improvement schools and to facilitate coordination with the regular program, a series of interactive television sessions were held during the 1991-92 school year. These programs could be viewed at thirty-six regional sites and were available on videotape on loan or could be purchased for the cost of duplication. The topics for these sessions were: Reading Recovery: An Overview; Special Education/Chapter 1 Links; Study Skills; Laying a Solid Foundation for Literacy Learning (The New Zealand Model); Conducting a Chapter 1 Needs Assessment; and H0TS: An Overview Awareness of National Diffusion Network (NDN) Programs.

Additional technical assistance has been provided through a videotape lending library. The available resources include commercially prepared tapes on effective teaching practices as well as the Interactive Television (ITV) programs prepared by the SEA using local and national speakers on topics chosen by the participating LEAs. These tapes make it possible for all staff members at a school to share in-service training.

Exiting Program Improvement

Exiting program improvement before fully implementing the program improvement plan is not much of an issue in Maine because the state requires all schools to assess their programs yearly. In essence, all schools are planning program improvements whether they are filing a formal plan with the SEA or not. Schools that report positive NCE gains, even though their plan has not been fully implemented, are encouraged to follow through. They may request any support they need from the SEA. They are also encouraged to report the evaluation of their plans on the annual statistical review. The program improvement plan and evaluation measures are further evaluated during the LEA review process.

Joint SEA/LEA Plans

Joint planning sessions were developed and are being conducted on an ongoing basis to build on the "full staff participation" theory. The sessions include participation by district administrators, principals, classroom teachers, and Chapter 1 staff in training on team-building strategies. Teaming techniques have been used extensively in the development of comprehensive school plans. The TAC has been instrumental in planning and implementing these sessions and after initial plans have been developed, SEA staff provides follow-up as requested.

Funding for Program Improvement

Approximately 50 percent of program improvement funds are used for minigrant contract agreements with LEAs in cooperative activities including technical assistance, in-service training, and contracted consultant services. This was discussed with the COP and adopted as part of the state plan.

Approximately 31 percent or 2.5 full-time equivalent (FTE), of state administration staff time is devoted to

responsibilities for Chapter 1 program improvement. State administrative funds support approximately 34 percent of the state technical assistance for program improvement.

SEA administrative activities have not been cut back as a result of increased attention devoted to program improvement. Program improvement activities are seen and implemented as a coordinated and integral part of Chapter 1 program review and planning. Program improvement is viewed as the key element in coordinating Chapter 1 monitoring and compliance requirements.

... assistance is designed to build on what is already in place and advance the state's education philosophy as set forth in the Maine Common Core of Learning.

Increasing Capacity for School Improvement

The Maine Division of Compensatory Education is currently working with LEAs, other SEA divisions, and RMC Research to facilitate the establishment of outcome goals, testing, and statewide performance data management. This difficult and time-consuming process is in the beginning stages and results will not be ready for at least two years. Adequate funding to develop performance tasks and to norm the findings is not available at this time.

Current resources are barely adequate, but are being used wisely for research, coordination, and training. When program improvement action plans are completely implemented, additional funding will be necessary so that these best practices such as Reading Recovery and HOTS can be supported. In Maine, Chapter 1 is currently staffed primarily with paraprofessionals. For these programs to be implemented, staffing will have to change to include teachers with the best and most training to work with the students with the greatest needs. In addition, university course development for directors of specialized services such as Chapter 1 is also important to build capacity for delivering the best possible service to the at-risk population.

Additional Chapter 1 Innovation and Reform

Schoolwide Projects

Currently two schools in Maine are eligible for schoolwide projects. The Maine Department of Education estimates that even if the low-income eligibility threshold were reduced from 75 percent to 40 percent, only a few schools in Maine would be eligible for schoolwide projects.

Statewide Coordination

There is an effort to coordinate SEA initiatives, including *Maine 2000*; family literacy; drop-out prevention; Student Assistance Teams; restructuring initiatives; and the Common Core of Learning. To better coordinate Chapter 1, every effort is made to include representatives from the schools in workshop planning sessions or educational opportunities provided by the SEA. Maine is also reviewing and revising forms to streamline the administrative paperwork requirements at the local level.

For the early primary years, Maine is allowing the use of Chapter 1 funds for Reading Recovery programs, encouraging extended-day kindergarten programs, holding informational sessions on early education and developmental practices, and distributing helpful articles.

Selection of students for Chapter 1 or special education has been an historic problem in Maine. A committee of state and local educators, representing Chapter 1 and special education, has been established to address the issue. Joint meetings with special education and Chapter 1 coordinators have been held periodically during the past two years. From these meetings, a better understanding of how to coordinate has developed. In November 1991, an ITV session was held as a first opportunity to share these issues. Tapes of the session were made available for those unable to participate, and coordinators have reported that having this tape makes it easier to share this information within their districts. Because state staff anticipates this communication challenge to be a continuing issue of concern, other sharing opportunities are planned.

Coordination of special education with Chapter 1 concerning similarities of students is facilitated by Chapter 1/special education coordinators' meetings, collaboration with the Student Assistance Team, and workshops on alternative delivery modes and student selection policies.

Some of the results of this initiative include: briefing papers, identification of promising practices, publications and presentations at the state and national level, and sponsorship of symposia and conferences related to integration of services.

The criteria for selecting limited-English-proficient (LEP) students for Chapter 1 services is the same criteria as for other students in the LEA Chapter 1 program. Collaborative efforts include information-sharing at the state level between Chapter 1 and bilingual staff and presentations by state personnel at local LEP workshops.

MAKING A DIFFERENCE SCHOOL BY SCHOOL

Program Improvement at Westbrook School Department, Westbrook

The needs assessment for the Westbrook School Department showed that junior high school students were achieving at lower than expected levels. The staff believed that the Chapter 1 program was not providing support necessary for their Chapter 1 students to exit the program and succeed on their own in the regular academic program. In addition, these Chapter 1 students did not like being singled out to come to Chapter 1, and attendance in school was poor.

Further investigation of the needs revealed that the problem was two-fold. The immediate goal was to improve instruction and attendance at the junior high. The long-term goal was to provide good first teaching at the primary grades so that fewer students would require remedial instruction at the upper grades.

The staff reviewed reading instruction for students in grades 4 through 7 and decided to implement the H0TS program. To do this, it was necessary to train staff and administrators, purchase or redistribute computers and software, and establish regular ongoing meetings for all involved staff. Workshops and other ways to distribute information were arranged for parents.

It was decided that Reading Recovery training would provide the instruction for the 1st graders to support accelerated learning and prevent early school failure. Reading Recovery trained staff would also provide in-service training to other staff and act as consultants for students at risk. To date, Westbrook has a Reading Recovery teacher-leader who trained in New York last year and has four additional Reading Recovery teachers-in-training. More teachers will be trained next year. This is the second year of a five-year plan.

Maryland

Chapter 1 Participation and Funding Summary

Participation Levels in School Year (SY) 1990-91

Number of Children Served:	73,056
Percentage of K-12 Children Served:	10%
Number and Percentage of School Districts Receiving Chapter 1 Assistance:	24; 100%
Number and Percentage of Schools Receiving Chapter 1 Assistance:	428; 50%

Chapter 1 Services by Grade Span in SY 1990-91

Preschool	8%
Kindergarten	20%
Grades 1-3	53%
Grades 4-6	18%
Grades 7-12	1%

State Funding Levels by School Year

Formula Grants Allocation SY 1990-91, 1991-92:	$79,058,419; $92,037,272
Formula Grants Allocation SY 1992-93:	$101,703,299
Chapter 1 Per Pupil Expenditure SY 1990-91:	$1,066
Program Improvement Allocation SY 1991-92, 1992-93:	$225,456; $374,229

Chapter 1 Program Improvement Summary

Number of Schools in Program Improvement in SY 1991-92

Total Number of Schools in Program Improvement:	283
Percentage of Chapter 1 Schools in Program Improvement:	70%
Number of Schools in Joint Planning:	63

Statewide Minimum Standards for Improvement–Two normal curve equivalent (NCE) gains in basic and advanced skills and substantial progress in achieving three locally developed desired outcomes.

Chapter 1 Program Improvement

Leveraging Accountability and Higher Performance

The state has raised the minimum NCE standard in two increments from any positive gain in 1989 to two NCEs in 1990-91. The State Board of Education and the Committee of Practitioners (COP) would like to raise the minimum standard to ensure growth for all children and especially accelerated growth for those most in need. The Board has recommended a graduated standard based on students' beginning points. Each school would have an aggregate NCE gain depending on its student body. Standards would range from three to seven NCEs.

The COP would like to raise the standard without focusing improvement on the results of a single test score. The committee members are considering ways to promote rigor in the desired outcomes, perhaps by tying outcomes to the newly adopted state school performance standards. The standards include demonstrated student academic achievement measured by a performance assessment. The COP would also like to see disadvantaged children performing at the same levels as other children. In particular, they are considering making the performance level in certain objectives the desired outcomes, which must be met by schools and students.

The state education agency (SEA) encourages the use of NCEs in coordination with other objective measures that can indicate progress within the school. If the state is to have a school focus on performance, it must have rigorous desired outcomes that enhance the information provided by norm-referenced tests.

Statewide Technical Assistance

In order to support the development of desired outcomes, state staff provides technical assistance to LEA (local education agency) coordinators and principals as they develop outcomes. In addition, workshops and administrative meetings focus on the development of these outcomes.

Schools identified for local program improvement may participate in state-designed program improvement training at regional locations. Staff members consult with the local coordinators to identify strategies for improvement, facilitate school improvement teams, provide staff development and resource materials, respond to proposed plans, and assist in implementation upon request. Chapter 1 program improvement funds are also available to identified schools.

A group of five to ten joint plan schools will participate in a pilot study to disseminate and implement promising strategies in school improvement. These schools will be selected based on need and their potential to make substantial

change. A series of staff development workshops with follow-up coaching are being developed based on the program improvement plans submitted December 1, 1991. Staff members will also do a desk review of the plans to assist schools in strengthening the plans and identifying available and needed resources. The state staff is recommending that schools implementing improvement plans conduct training in using advanced skills for all staff working with identified children. The state will provide regional training workshops followed by on-site follow up in the second semester.

The SEA coordinates the monitoring and compliance requirements through ongoing communication with schools to assist them in making sure that the changes being implemented are consistent with the compliance provisions. In order to reduce the negative reaction at the local level accompanying the identification of schools for improvement, the SEA has been proactive through: regular reports to local coordinators about new requirements and services, meetings with LEA superintendents, hearings on proposed changes to the program improvement standards, technical assistance meetings for schools in local improvement, briefings of other state staff on the requirements, dissemination of innovative strategies such as National Diffusions Network (NDN) projects, and ongoing consultation with local systems that request assistance.

Exiting Program Improvement

Thirteen percent of the schools identified for Chapter 1 program improvement based on the 1989-90 testing cycle exited the program after the 1990-91 testing cycle. The SEA feels that this is a direct result of putting in place a program improvement process. Many of the schools showed substantial improvement in their test scores and also noted that when they were identified, they began to look at the achievement of all their children and to make changes.

The SEA has taken the following steps to encourage schools to fully implement their program improvement plans: requiring that plans be developed and implemented beginning December 1 of the following year so that schools begin the change process prior to seeing the next annual test results, implementing assurances that guarantee that the schools engage in a real annual review process, coordinating the Chapter 1 improvement process with the overall school improvement program, and providing technical assistance and staff development in critical areas so that school systems may increase their ability to meet program challenges.

Joint SEA/LEA Plans

Educators from schools that needed to develop joint plans with the state were required to attend a three-day summer workshop to introduce strategies for refining the program improvement process. One topic covered in the session was the development of a profile of the school program based on information for the schools as a whole and the Chapter 1 program. Participants also learned ways to disaggregate data in order to assess the causes for a lack of academic progress. Groups from each school were exposed to team-building strategies in order to develop a team vision. Graphics were used to help participants see the relationship between such diverse elements of school performance as test scores; grading and grouping practices; participation in extra curricular activities; race; sex; school organization; teaching techniques; and parent, student, and staff expectations of children. Teams were guided in finding patterns in the data that could help them fine-tune the plan they had implemented the previous year.

The Technical Assistance Center (TAC) provided a workshop on ways to provide effective staff development to support the plan. School teams began their plans at this workshop and state staff provided follow-up assistance at the local site. This took various forms, including: additional workshops, technical assistance to central office staff, and participation in school improvement team deliberations. The SEA assistant superintendent for compensatory education, the SEA branch chief for compensatory education, the local Chapter 1 coordinator, and sometimes the district superintendent interviewed each of the school principals to ensure that they had developed potentially successful plans.

The state staff will visit schools regularly to assist in plan implementation. Faced with declining revenues, the state staff will assist schools in looking for creative ways to provide staff development. Program improvement funds are available for these schools through a competitive grant process.

Initial joint plans restructure the assignment of Chapter 1 staff to: focus on the students most in need, use advanced thinking strategies as a vehicle to teach basic skills, coordinate the program throughout the school, and provide staff development and training for both regular and Chapter 1 staff who work with identified children. Principals have also focused on ensuring that children are exposed to all parts of the curriculum and often include plans for structured observations of classroom instruction to ensure that new strategies are put into practice.

Funding for Program Improvement

All of the 1990-91 program improvement funds have been distributed. The date for receipt of improvement plans has been changed to ensure that plans are on file by second semester and prior to the first date for request of program improvement funds. All funds are currently used for mini-grants to LEAs.

Also, approximately 85 percent of Chapter 1 state administrative time is devoted to responsibilities for program improvement. All of the state technical assistance in program improvement is supported by state administrative funds. An increased focus on technical assistance in program improvement has reduced school compliance monitoring. School visits focus on assisting with the

implementation of improvement plans. Also, staff can identify other resources, provide in-service and demonstration lessons, deliver curriculum materials, and so on.

Increasing Capacity for School Improvement

Maryland is currently implementing a school improvement/school performance initiative for all schools. Chapter 1 has been in the forefront of the process. Maryland school systems need assistance in designing outcome goals and measures that drive instruction without limiting it. The need for effective data management is critical at all levels. The state lacks the staff, data capacity, and management system necessary to accommodate the information needed to make informed school improvement decisions in a timely manner.

Specific technical assistance that would be undertaken with additional funding includes: assisting schools and systems in implementing database systems to manage information, developing a Chapter 1 database as a component of the school performance system or a separate entity, and staff development to increase SEA capacity to assist in the areas of outcome goals, testing, and data management. The SEA's resources for Chapter 1 are woefully inadequate, given the magnitude of the task.

Additional Chapter 1 Innovation and Reform

Schoolwide Projects

Number of schoolwide projects in Maryland by school year:

1989-90	31
1990-91	33
1991-92	30

According to the State Department of Education, fifty-two Chapter 1 schools were eligible for schoolwide projects in 1990-91.

Schoolwide projects have adopted and adapted several education models: Success for All, Accelerated Schools, Comer, and individualized education. Typical reorganizations include in-school tutoring using teachers and paraprofessionals, cross-age grouping, extended day and extended-year programs, team teaching, and clustering of organizations.

The SEA encourages the use of schoolwide projects to help systems enhance learning in very deprived situations, particularly when systems require massive school reorganization to obtain good academic results.

To date, schoolwide projects have been able to meet the maintenance of effort requirements; however, with declining education budgets throughout the state, the SEA anticipates that schools will experience difficulty in the 1991-1992 school year. About 20 percent of schoolwide projects experience difficulties in meeting the program improvement requirements and are in joint planning.

The SEA makes the following estimates of the number of schools that would be eligible for schoolwide projects if the low-income eligibility threshold were reduced from 75 percent to the following levels: 102 schools at 60 percent, 138 schools at 50 percent, and 202 schools at 40 percent.

Statewide Coordination

The SEA compensatory education staff and the school accountability/performance staff have discussed integrating the Chapter 1 requirements into the overall school improvement structure so that schools can submit a single, consolidated school improvement plan that addresses the educational needs of all students. A representative of the school performance staff is a member of the COP which allows staff input into developing standards and Chapter 1 policy for improvement.

Maryland also operates a state-sponsored compensatory education program, which targets a population similar to that targeted by Chapter 1. It requires funds to be used for similar educational purposes and is operated by the same personnel who work with Chapter 1. The LEA is provided a consolidated application and the monitoring requirements are similar and coordinated.

In order to coordinate education and early childhood programs, the SEA participates in an interagency council for the education of young children, which includes representatives of all agencies serving this group. The SEA has encouraged the development of preschool and early primary years programs for more than twelve years. Seventy-six percent of the compensatory education programs in the state serve students at grade 3 or lower. SEA offices are developing guidelines about coordination of the various categorical programs in the classroom.

The SEA's resources for Chapter 1 are woefully inadequate, given the magnitude of the task.

The state recommends that limited English proficient (LEP) students be selected for Chapter 1 services based on needs in the area of reading, math, and language using methods similar to those used for non-LEP students. These selection procedures should not be focused only on the inability of a student to speak English. The state recommends use of the state-developed guidelines for second language services and suggested strategies. Staff members rely heavily on the SEA staff specialist in bilingual/English-as-a-second-language programs for assistance. The bilingual equity specialist and the second language specialist have addressed Chapter 1 coordinators on implementing programs that meet Chapter 1 regulations and LEP needs.

There is ongoing consultation between special educators and Chapter 1 staff on provisions of special education services in schools. Each LEA includes in its application a description of how special education students will be served.

Making a Difference School by School

Schoolwide Project at Tench Tilghman Elementary School, Baltimore

Tench Tilghman Elementary School is beginning its second cycle as a schoolwide project. This year, the schoolwide program includes: an after-school tutoring program centered on thinking skills, a crisis center to reduce classroom disruption and disciplinary removals, cooperation with outside agencies; a program to reduce retentions, and an alternative learning center.

The alternative learning center is designed to provide the most appropriate set of instructional strategies and related services to increase the motivation and success of high-risk students. It is a response to the schools desire to give socially, economically, and educationally deprived students a richer learning experience. Each class in the alternative center is grouped on a cross-age, non-graded basis. Methods and activities include instruction in reading, writing, and mathematics based on careful analysis of standardized test results as well as the administration of a placement test. Instructional strategies are designed to meet students' learning styles as determined by the administration of a learning style inventory. Learning packets are developed for use in the classroom and learning contracts are used when necessary. The goal of the center is to help high-risk students return to the full-size classroom.

Program Improvement at Taneytown Elementary, Carroll County

Taneytown Elementary performed a variety of formal and informal assessment activities as part of program analysis. First, staff input was gathered through the Chapter 1 Self Assessment Instrument. Teachers revealed concerns about academic learning time and parent involvement. Parent involvement in monitoring homework and supporting good work habits was noted as being specfically important. School improvement team members brainstormed qualities of an effective school during informal sessions, and they determined that a successful school is one that practices good instruction in a positive climate with few disruptions. Finally, standardized test data were disaggregated and analyzed by grade level and gender. Significant findings included depressed reading scores in grade 2, as well as large differences in the achievement of Chapter 1 males and females. Males were found to score somewhat higher in math, but considerably lower in reading than their female classmates.

The Chapter 1 improvement plan was modified for the 1991-92 school year to meet the assessed needs. Programs that encourage self-esteem and parental involvement—particularly the Home Visitation Team and Parent Resource Room—were continued. Academic needs, specifically as they relate to standardized test results, are being addressed through a combination of quality instruction and a focus on test-taking strategies. Ongoing staff development is provided during monthly staff meetings. Additional staff, including one full-time and one half-time assistant, an additional collegial model teacher, and a Chapter 1 Resource Teacher were provided, and instructional time for Chapter 1 students was increased. Students with the greatest needs, particularly boys, were identified for individualized reading assistance in the MORE (Moving On with Reading Enrichment) program. Computers were placed in classrooms to allow for increased use and access. Administrators and resource teachers meet regularly with grade-level teams to analyze assessments.

Massachusetts

Chapter 1 Participation and Funding Summary

Participation Levels in School Year (SY) 1990-91

Number of Children Served:	76,350
Percentage of K-12 Children Served:	9%
Number and Percentage of School Districts Receiving Chapter 1 Assistance:	325; 75%
Number and Percentage of Schools Receiving Chapter 1 Assistance:	1,012; 56%

Chapter 1 Services by Grade Span in SY 1990-91

Preschool	2%
Kindergarten	6%
Grades 1-3	40%
Grades 4-6	30%
Grades 7-12	22%

State Funding Levels by School Year

Formula Grants Allocation SY 1990-91, 1991-92:	$108,891,109; $127,229,157
Formula Grants Allocation SY 1992-93:	$142,239,863
Chapter 1 Per Pupil Expenditure SY 1990-91:	$1,286
Program Improvement Allocation SY 1991-92; 1992-93:	$341,537; $567,537

Chapter 1 Program Improvement Summary

Number of Schools in Program Improvement in SY 1991-92

Total Number of Schools in Program Improvement:	172
Percentage of Chapter 1 Schools in Program Improvement:	17%
Number of Schools in Joint Planning:	6

Statewide Minimum Standards for Improvement–One normal curve equivalent (NCE) gain in basic and advanced skills and substantial progress in achieving locally set desired outcomes.

Chapter 1 Program Improvement

Leveraging Accountability and Higher Performance

The state education agency (SEA) supports Chapter 1 program improvement because it has initiated action where there would otherwise be none. Despite the shortcomings of relying on NCEs as a measure of improvement, Chapter 1 program improvement serves as an important framework for improving the outcomes of disadvantaged children. The SEA knows of no low-performing schools that avoid program improvement because they are making the minimum NCE gains.

Statewide Technical Assistance

The Massachusetts state plan makes optional the use of other desired outcomes in addition to NCE gains on norm-referenced tests. The SEA provides workshops through the Technical Assistance Center (TAC) for the development of other desired outcomes. At this time, there is no minimum statewide standard for other desired outcomes, although the SEA is currently considering establishing one. The Committee of Practitioners (COP) has discouraged higher statewide standards in terms of both NCE gains and achievement of other desired outcomes.

Massachusetts has raised the minimum NCE standard since 1989 when the standard of "equal to or greater than zero" was established. The SEA has proposed that the COP raise the current minimum standard of one NCE to two NCEs. At this time the COP opposes raising the NCE standard.

The SEA aggressively works to assist each district in all aspects of program administration, including an annual needs assessment and evaluation. Annual revisions of the three-year application are reviewed by Chapter 1 SEA specialists. This process and the monitoring process in which every Chapter 1 program is visited at least once a year serve as the vehicles for providing technical assistance to schools in need of program improvement.

A school identified for improvement has a variety of opportunities to receive technical assistance. Workshops at various locations throughout the state are held in the fall and again in the spring. The workshops are jointly planned and implemented by members of the TAC and the SEA Chapter 1 staff. On-site and telephone assistance is available to all program improvement schools to assist them with the development and initial implementation of a Program Improvement Plan (PIP). The grant application stresses the importance of a thorough needs assessment of both the Chapter 1 component which failed to meet the state standard, as well as the total school curriculum and school climate. Once specific needs are identified, the LEA may request the assistance of any SEA staff member working in the related needs areas.

The Massachusetts Department of Education's comprehensive approach to providing technical assistance involves all bureaus and divisions within the agency. In addition, the SEA has hired a Chapter 1 reading specialist to assist those LEAs that need programmatic and curricular changes in reading. The SEA plans to hire a Chapter 1 mathematics specialist to assist LEAs and to link Chapter 1 programs with the SEA's National Science Foundation-funded Statewide Systemic Change Initiative in Mathematics and Science.

There have been four strategies employed to date to coordinate Chapter 1 monitoring and compliance requirements with Chapter 1 program improvement goals: ongoing training is provided to all those with monitoring responsibilities, the monitoring instrument has been modified to include questions pertinent to program improvement, the LEA plan must be submitted for review by the SEA/Chapter 1 specialist and program improvement specialist prior to submission of the General Application, and the SEA/Chapter 1 specialist is informed and involved in all meetings between the program improvement specialist and the school.

The SEA takes the position that the education of Chapter 1 students is the responsibility of all educators at the school site. As such, in all forms of communication to superintendents, principals, and local Chapter 1 staff, the SEA has stated that Chapter 1 students' success or failure to achieve is a schoolwide and systemwide responsibility. The SEA has encouraged all school personnel to use identification as an opportunity for collaboration and schoolwide improvement.

The SEA has developed a comprehensive PIP form that all schools must complete and submit for SEA review. This form is designed to ensure a holistic and collaborative planning process. Teams that represent a broad cross-section of the LEA school personnel and Chapter 1 teachers, parents, and students at the secondary level must be actively involved in the development of the plan.

Identified schools that apply for planning grants must follow a process similar in design to the process outlined above. In FY93, the SEA hopes to be able to expand this approach to allow schools to apply for implementation grants if the plan submitted to the SEA is considered satisfactory.

The SEA provides a number of training opportunities on advanced skills to district and school staff. This includes a Statewide Chapter 1 Dissemination Project, which provides 210 Chapter 1 districts with ongoing workshops in advanced skills areas, several TAC sponsored workshops in problem-solving strategies, a Statewide Chapter 1 Computer Cooperative which gives ongoing training in such computer programs as HOTS (Higher Order Thinking Skills), and on-site assistance from Chapter 1 specialists and program improvement specialists.

The SEA has stressed advanced skills across department lines for the past six years. As districts modify classroom curricula to include these skills, such changes should be reflected in the Chapter 1 component as well.

Successful Models

In schoolwide projects under program improvement, the predominant model used is the team teaching approach with the Chapter 1 and regular education teacher in the classroom. In other Chapter 1 schools, there is no single predominant model or strategy. Many, however, focus on improving curriculum alignment between Chapter 1 and regular education, especially where whole language or developmental math (manipulatives) have been introduced systemwide. Cooperative learning as an instructional strategy within the classroom is an area of relatively high interest with many schools undertaking program improvement.

Exiting Program Improvement

Ninety-six out of 148 schools, or 65 percent of those identified for program improvement based on the 1989-90 testing cycle, tested out of program improvement before their plans were fully implemented. The SEA believes that approximately 70 percent tested out due to the development and partial implementation of the plan, and the remaining 30 percent were the result of test score aberrations.

The SEA encourages all schools to fully implement their plans. A copy of the plan must be submitted to the SEA staff who check on the status of all plans developed during their annual monitoring visits.

Joint SEA/LEA Plans

After a school becomes subject to the provisions of a joint SEA-LEA PIP, a member of the state Chapter 1 staff is assigned to work with that school as a member of the PIP Development Team. As such, the staff member attends planning meetings and serves as resource broker to the team.

The state has involved members of the TAC in developing an overall strategy regarding joint plans and initial meetings with LEAs. Meetings with the LEA staff are held prior to meeting with members of the school staff. This arrangement has proven successful in fostering systemwide cooperation in the early stages of the program improvement process. Technical assistance is more intense than that provided to those in years one or two of program improvement.

The SEA sets aside program improvement funds for expenses incurred in developing the joint plan and, if needed, additional funds for implementing the plan. At this time, Massachusetts' first joint plans are still in the development stage; therefore, the SEA is unable to comment on either the unique attributes of these plans or their effectiveness.

Funding for Program Improvement

Between 70 and 80 percent of the program improvement funds are used for mini-grants to LEAs.

Almost all state technical assistance in program improvement is supported by state administrative funds. One SEA staff member spends 100 percent of staff time on program improvement responsibilities. A second staff member spends approximately 50 percent of work time on such duties. All other staff members have ongoing oversight responsibilities in program improvement, which constitutes an approximate one-half full-time equivalent (FTE). Therefore, a total of approximately two FTEs is devoted to program improvement at this time.

Increasing Capacity for School Improvement

The SEA recommends a change in the law to allow a percent of the program improvement allocation to be used by the SEA to hire more program improvement specialists, evaluators, and consultants. This would enable the SEA to identify trends and provide a more comprehensive and systematic approach toward technical assistance services than currently exists.

As a result of staffing limitations and increased attention to program improvement, the SEA has been unable to complete the annual state evaluation in a timely manner, undertake long range planning for staff development, develop and initiate state training sessions, and provide sufficient assistance to schools undertaking schoolwide projects.

Additional Chapter 1 Innovation and Reform

Schoolwide Projects

Number of schoolwide projects in Massachusetts by school year:

1989-1990	26
1990-1991	42
1991-1992	80

In addition to the forty-two operating schoolwide projects, an additional ten were eligible to operate as such during the 1990-91 school year.

The Massachusetts public education system is predicated on local control. As such, the SEA has historically facilitated, rather than initiated, school change. Consistent with this practice, the SEA supports and assists any school or district interested in developing a schoolwide project. At the annual statewide directors meeting in March, one of the sessions was devoted to discussion of issues specific to schoolwide projects.

In the past, the SEA has offered informational workshops on schoolwide projects. Due to the inadequacy of staffing levels, however, the SEA has relied on the TAC to provide on-site technical assistance. In an effort to address this area, the SEA is currently planning, with assistance from the TAC, a more comprehensive series of workshops.

The TAC is undertaking a survey for the U.S. Department of Education to determine what curriculum, instructional, and organizational changes have been undertaken in schools through schoolwide projects. A preliminary review suggests changes consistent with those areas the SEA is promoting across divisional lines including: implementation of Effective Schools research in improving school climate; integration and enhanced coordination of regular education, Chapter 1, special education, and Transitional Bilingual Education/ English-as-a-second language (ESL) programs; family literacy programs; interdisciplinary studies; and instructional strategies consistent with stages of developmental learning.

Of the eighty schoolwide projects currently in operation, twenty-eight are currently in program improvement. Therefore, one might predict that up to 35 percent could have problems in meeting the performance requirements related to aggregate achievement gains. However, it is the SEA's belief that the planning process the state has implemented for program improvement will result in the majority of these schools meeting their desired outcomes.

The Massachusetts Department of Education's comprehensive approach to providing technical assistance involves all bureaus and divisions within the agency.

Coordination with the Regular Classroom

The SEA encourages LEAs to provide Chapter 1 services in the regular classroom and to coordinate services with the regular classroom teacher in a variety of ways. During monitoring visits, the SEA Chapter 1 specialist's role includes: problem identification and on-site technical assistance; the dissemination of a practitioner's guide to all Chapter 1 directors and local superintendents, it describes a variety of practices with which to improve the coordination between Chapter 1 and regular education, workshops conducted throughout the year on coordination by SEA staff and consultants in the field; and Chapter 1 funds set aside in a discretionary grant program (LEAs may apply for if they follow appropriate models for staff development).

In an effort to improve the preparation of teachers of children in pre-kindergarten through grade 3, all such teachers must complete requirements for a joint certificate in early childhood and special education. In addition, the requirements to qualify as a reading teacher have been strengthened. Both of these changes should improve the capacity of Chapter 1 and regular education teachers to meet the needs of Chapter 1 students in the regular classroom. It must be noted, however, that if class sizes continue to escalate proportionate to the level of the past two years, the use of pull-out models may become more desirable for regular classroom teachers.

Statewide Coordination

As a result of school reform measures passed into law in 1985, several initiatives were implemented to promote school improvement. One such initiative was the Essential Skills Program intended to address the basic skills development of at-risk populations. Other SEA initiatives that are currently funded by either state or federal funds focus on systemic restructuring as a vehicle for school improvement. However, funding has declined over the past three years, making it impossible to adequately sustain these activities.

In an effort to reduce the administrative paperwork requirements at the local level, the SEA annually reviews the Chapter 1 general application in order to ensure that it is current with the most recent regulations, policy directives, or judicial decisions. Extraneous and outdated data is removed. The SEA is currently engaged in an inter-divisional examination of the mandates and grant applications with the intended purpose of reducing duplication at the local level and increasing the efficiency and effectiveness of the SEA administration.

Coordination between the state Chapter 1 Office and the Bureau of Early Childhood Programs has increased significantly. These offices jointly planned and sponsored a statewide conference on March 4, 1992. The SEA actively advocates preschool-early childhood components. The SEA administers supplemental state funds to Head Start and encourages Head Start and public school collaboration. It should be noted that some LEAs are reluctant to use Chapter 1 funds for early childhood education at the expense of serving all eligible students in the school system. The SEA recognizes a need to develop a more comprehensive approach in creating cost-effective models for local directors to use as pilot programs in this area.

The SEA has undertaken a number of strategies to guide LEAs in the area of integrating instruction to all students. It has distributed guidelines and programmatic models to LEAs and provided workshops statewide. In addition, the Lucretia Crocker Fellows program, in which exemplary teachers are selected by the state to work with school districts that wish to replicate the successful models they have developed, has annually included integration models in either Chapter 1, special education, or bilingual education. Last, the Massachusetts Leadership Academy includes these concepts in its year-long training of administrators.

The criterion that the state recommends for selecting limited-English-proficient (LEP) students for Chapter 1 services is strictly based on educational deprivation. In an effort to address the issues facing disadvantaged LEP children who qualify for both types of services, the SEA holds joint meetings between the two respective staffs, includes topics of joint interest in conferences, and collaborates on identifying experts in the field who can provide technical assistance to LEAs.

There is no formal coordination between Chapter 1 and special education taking place at this time. A state law recently enacted has clarified the state definition of special needs. It is expected that one outcome of this clarification of standards will be an increased demand for Chapter 1 services. As such, the SEA is advising LEAs to clearly delineate and make public the definition of "educationally disadvantaged" for the purpose of providing Chapter 1 services. The SEA is mindful that this is an area requiring further attention and state guidance.

Making a Difference School by School

Schoolwide Project at Canterbury Street Magnet School, Worcester

Canterbury Street School is a 420-pupil, K-6 elementary school with a large number of pupils from low socio-economic backgrounds. Almost 50 percent of the school's population is composed of minority students representing a variety of ethnic and racial groupings. Despite the availability of a bilingual program at another school, many of the Vietnamese students request the opportunity to attend Canterbury Street School. These LEP students require special developmental reading programs and instruction in ESL. The school has a 30 percent transient rate.

The Canterbury Street School program is structured to permit an uninterrupted reading and language arts block in the morning to which all teachers and other staff are assigned. This procedure reduces the size of groups and places accountability for instruction on all school personnel.

During the morning, Chapter 1 teachers are responsible to teach in the areas of reading, language arts, and mathematics in grades 1-6. At the end of the uninterrupted reading and language arts block, the Chapter 1 teachers provide small group instruction and/or intensive one-to-one tutorial services to students having difficulties in a particular subject area. These services are given using the in-class model rather than pull-out services which minimizes the fragmentation of the student's day and prevents labeling by their peers.

A full time curriculum specialist is responsible for organizing the entire

school program under the direction of the school principal. Funded by Chapter 1, the specialist meets on a regular basis with staff and administrators to assist in arranging for appropriate staff development programs. The specialist also coordinates parental involvement activities.

Program Improvement at Center School, Everett

The first step taken by Center School after it was identified for program improvement in FY89 was to develop a program improvement plan. In the plan, the school listed as its primary goals increased parental involvement, improved skills in reading comprehension, and raised expectations for student learning and behavior.

A number of changes were implemented to achieve these goals. Chapter 1 staff are now an integral part of the regular school staff. Chapter 1 teachers attend faculty meetings, in-school curriculum meetings and grade level system-wide meetings. One Chapter 1 teacher is a member of the Building Integration Team that meets weekly to discuss students who are experiencing difficulties and to help coordinate and review all plans for integration of regular and special education students within the school. Another teacher is on the Teacher Assistance Team, which is a school-level, teacher-centered support system to serve students in the regular education environment. The Chapter 1 Administrator serves on the Steering Committee for Systemic Change.

Kindergarten children are now included in the program and ESL classes have been established. A combination of in-class and pull-out instructional Chapter 1 models are used. Cross-grade reading for regular classroom as well as Chapter 1 students, partner reading between upper- and lower-class children, team teaching, cooperative learning and extended kindergarten day for ESL children are some examples of innovative practices born out of school improvement. The Chapter 1 teachers work before and after school and during lunch time as the parent participant for children whose parents do not participate in the home/school partnership program.

One of the most powerful features of this program is the continuous effort to integrate Chapter 1 reading into the regular classroom curriculum. A collaborative effort among Chapter 1 and regular classroom teachers, parents, administrators, and special service staff provides structure that complements the instructional goals of the regular school curriculum. In general, the model is a combination of an in-class and pull-out program. Because consistent expectations are maintained, very little time is lost on non-academic activities. Instructional time is maximized. Clinical supervision of the Chapter 1 staff with assessments of time on task is monitored for efficiency by an outside evaluator and supervised by the Chapter 1 Administrator. Learning activities are varied to provide both challenge and success to participants. A diagnostic-prescriptive approach to instruction has been implemented. Each student takes an individual criterion-referenced test to determine strengths, weakness, and needs. A computer printout shows what each student already knows, needs to review, and needs to be taught. Learning goals and objectives are developed with active input from the classroom teachers. Techniques for learning how to learn are encouraged.

All of these program changes have resulted in a school truly turned around, as evidenced in the improved NCE gains of 1.1 in FY89, 6.2 in FY90, and 12.3 in FY91.

Michigan

Chapter 1 Participation and Funding Summary

Participation Levels in School Year (SY) 1990-91

Number of Children Served:	159,806
Percentage of K-12 Children Served:	9%
Number and Percentage of School Districts Receiving Chapter 1 Assistance:	562; 100%
Percentage of Schools Receiving Chapter 1 Assistance:	2,073; 60%

Chapter 1 Services by Grade Span in SY 1990-91

Preschool	3%
Kindergarten	6%
Grades 1-3	47%
Grades 4-6	29%
Grades 7-12	15%

State Funding Levels by School Year

Formula Grants Allocation SY 1990-91, 1991-92:	$184,616,536; $215,305,981
Formula Grants Allocation SY 1992-93:	$240,054,096
Chapter 1 Per Pupil Expenditure SY 1990-91:	$1,100
Program Improvement Allocation SY 1991-92, 1992-93:	$530,000; $927,547

Chapter 1 Program Improvement Summary

Number of Schools in Program Improvement in SY 1991-92

Total Number of Schools in Program Improvement:	705
Percentage of Chapter 1 Schools in Program Improvement:	34%
Number of Schools in Joint Planning:	101

Statewide Minimum Standards for Improvement–Greater than two normal curve equivalent (NCE) gains in basic and advanced skills (greater than three NCEs for the 1992-93 school year), and substantial progress in achieving locally determined desired outcomes.

Chapter 1 Program Improvement

Leveraging Accountability and Higher Performance

The two NCE standard for 1991-92 and the three NCE standard for 1992-93 represent an increase in the standard, which was raised from zero NCEs in 1989. The Committee of Practitioners (COP) has encouraged higher statewide standards in terms of NCE gains. However, the COP has opposed any requirement for local education agencies (LEAs) to establish other desired outcomes and believes this should be left to the discretion of LEAs.

Through the program improvement plan, the state education agency (SEA) encourages LEAs to establish other desired outcomes in addition to NCE gains. The SEA emphasizes that LEAs should use the achievement indicators they believe are most valid in evaluating their Chapter 1 programs. LEAs have not, for the most part, established non-NCE desired outcomes. Many LEAs could use other achievement indicators that they believe are more valid, but do not do so because they would still be judged by NCE gains for program improvement identification.

Statewide Technical Assistance

After a school is identified for program improvement, the SEA helps review the current LEA program and develops a program improvement plan upon request and to the extent that SEA staff time is available. When Chapter 1 was reauthorized in 1988, the SEA had already begun work with practitioners throughout the state to develop reading and mathematics goals that emphasized advanced skills. The statewide assessment tests have also been revised to better measure such skills. SEA trainers and a network of local trainers are available to help LEAs align their Chapter 1 and regular instructional programs with these objectives.

To reduce the negative reaction at the local level that might accompany the identification of schools for program improvement or the initiation of joint plans, SEA staff has consistently tried to emphasize the positive aspects of program improvement, including the opportunity to experiment and take risks and the availability of additional funding. Michigan schools are also involved in state-mandated school improvement, which has helped the Chapter 1 requirement become more easily accepted.

Successful Models

During visits to program improvement schools, the SEA observes the use of new reading and mathematics curriculum and instructional strategies to promote advanced skills. The additions include the Michigan Redefinition of Reading, New Directions in Mathematics Instruction, and the Higher Order Thinking Skills (HOTS) program.

Exiting Program Improvement

Of the schools identified for program improvement in the 1989-90 testing cycle, 128 (32%) exited program improvement after the 1990-91 school year. The SEA encourages schools that test out of program improvement before fully implementing their plans to continue in the program improvement process. The SEA continues to make funds available to schools as part of its program improvement plan.

Joint SEA/LEA Plans

For schools qualifying for joint program improvement plans, the SEA provides assistance in reviewing the current program and developing the improvement plan. Assistance is provided on-site by SEA compensatory education consultants through meetings with the LEA Chapter 1 director and staff of identified schools. SEA reading and mathematics specialists are also involved when appropriate. After improvement plans are developed, they will be funded with program improvement funds and additional LEA Chapter 1 funds if needed. SEA compensatory education consultants will ensure that appropriate in-service providers and other resources are secured by the LEAs. No joint plans have been finalized, but the direction of the planning indicates that most will focus on sustained in-service activities to improve both Chapter 1 and regular classroom instruction.

Funding for Program Improvement

The State Department of Education has distributed all of the 1990-91 program improvement grants to LEAs through mini-grants. In addition, approximately 25 percent of Chapter 1 state administration staff time, which is supported completely by state administrative funds, is devoted to responsibilities for program improvement. As a result of the increased attention devoted to program improvement, the SEA has had to cut back time devoted to application review, monitoring, and technical assistance to LEAs that do not have schools identified for program improvement.

Chapter 1 program improvement review is coordinated with state monitoring. The status of required program improvement activities is reviewed during monitoring visits, and assistance is provided as part of the visit, if needed.

Increasing Capacity for School Improvement

The Chapter 1 program improvement effort in Michigan is supported in content and process by the reading, mathematics, and school improvement initiatives in the state. Currently, the main problem is a shortage of staff to effectively perform the SEA's expanded Chapter 1 role.

SEA and LEA staff participated together in Accelerated Schools training in the summer of 1991 so that the SEA consultants could assist the LEAs in developing schoolwide projects based on these models.

Additional Chapter 1 Innovation and Reform

Schoolwide projects

Number of schoolwide projects in Michigan by school year:

1989-90:	2
1990-91:	36
1991-92:	71

There has been a substantial increase in the number of schoolwide projects in the state over the last three school years. According to the SEA, approximately 24 percent of the schools eligible for Chapter 1 schoolwide projects in 1990-91 undertook them. Under current law, approximately 150 schools in the state are eligible for schoolwide projects.

LEAs with eligible schools are encouraged to look into promising models. SEA and LEA staff participated together in Accelerated Schools training in the summer of 1991 so that the SEA consultants could assist the LEAs in developing schoolwide projects based on these models.

Examples of successful strategies used in schoolwide projects include: new reading and mathematics curriculum and instructional strategies to promote advanced skills, outcome-based education and Accelerated Schools, and cooperative learning. The SEA encourages the use of new reading and mathematics curriculum and instruction and specific models as appropriate to the school. It also helps LEAs and schools incorporate successful models by providing information, contact people, and in-service training, and by encouraging networking among LEAs.

Some of the results of schoolwide projects in the state include: team teaching by Chapter 1 and regular teachers, closer monitoring of individual student progress and reteaching as needed, and greater involvement of district resource staff in ensuring success for all students. When school staffs are truly committed to change, they are able to turn schools around.

The SEA makes the following estimates of the number of schools that would be eligible for schoolwide projects if the low-income eligibility threshold were reduced from 75 percent to the following levels: 250 schools at 60 percent, 330 schools at 50 percent, and 400 schools at 40 percent.

Coordination with the Regular Classroom

LEAs are required to coordinate services with the regular classroom teacher. The coordination plan is described in the LEA application and monitored by the SEA, which is neutral on the issue of in-class versus pull-out services. Recent comprehensive literature reviews indicate that the quality of instruction is much more important than the setting.

The SEA makes in-service training on inclusive education widely available. Its primary focus on special education. This in-service program is conducted in part by university staff.

Statewide Coordination

Michigan is working to coordinate Chapter 1 program improvement with its state school improvement initiative. Michigan passed legislation (P.A. 25) requires that each school have a school improvement plan and issue an annual educational report with achievement results. SEA staff members encourage identified schools to make their Chapter 1 improvement plan a part of their school improvement plan, and all schools are encouraged to report their Chapter 1 achievement gains in their annual educational reports. To facilitate this coordination, the School Improvement Office has established a consultant position to provide technical assistance to LEAs and ensure that school improvement facilitators in the state's network are trained to help LEAs coordinate Chapter 1 efforts with those called for in P.A. 25.

In conjunction with Chapter 1, the Michigan State Department of Education operates a $23 million state-funded Article 3 program, which provides funding to high-poverty LEAs for supplementary reading and mathematics programs in grades K-10. The program is closely coordinated with Chapter 1 at the LEA and SEA level, administered by the same SEA staff, and monitored in conjunction with Chapter 1. Separate applications are submitted by the LEAs for each program, however, because the amount of Article 3 funding is not determined until mid-summer or later. This need for separate applications is the only hindrance to coordination.

In order to streamline program administration, the state Chapter 1 office has moved from a year-to-year application to a three-year application. Procedures for amending the application and equipment management requirements have been eased also.

Michigan seeks coordination between Chapter 1 and preschool through a $25 million state program for disadvantaged preschool students. The application for this program describes coordination with Head Start and Chapter 1 and Chapter 1 SEA staff work together to strengthen this coordination.

The criteria used for providing Chapter 1 services to limited-English-proficient (LEP) children are those listed in the Chapter 1 regulations. Some LEAs have difficulty separating limited-English proficiency from educational deprivation. Staff from the Chapter 1 and bilingual education units have worked together to develop guidance in this area. In-service programs are provided on curriculum/instructional strategies to coordinate the work of Chapter 1 and special education teachers. The SEA also helps LEAs coordinate and integrate categorical programs by assisting in program development and sharing information about successfully integrated programs.

Making a Difference School by School

Schoolwide Project at Guyton School, Detroit

Guyton Elementary School went through the State Department of Education accreditation process during the 1990-91 school year. This process provided a self-study and needs assessment, which coincided with results of internal assessments as Guyton updated its school improvement plan. The mission of Guyton's schoolwide program is stated as follows: "The Staff of Guyton Elementary School believes that all children can learn and should be given the opportunity to succeed."

Guyton's primary thrust is early intervention in order to promote positive behavior patterns, student attendance, and socialization skills. First grade class sizes were lowered to increase individual assistance to students, and grade expectations for grades K-2 were developed and instituted so that students and parents became aware of the necessary skills for promotion.

Guyton has also planned parental training sessions, tutoring programs, and improved school-home communication.

Through coordinated planning, the lab teachers will support the regular classroom language arts and math curriculums. Weekly conferences between classroom and lab teachers will help them to plan and guide instruction as well as monitor student progress. For those students who have scored low on the California Achievement Test for the last two consecutive years, the school has written an individual improvement plan and student progress reports will be enclosed with the students' report cards. Parents will also be informed of their children's participation in the Chapter 1 program by means of telephone conferences and parent/teacher conferences at school.

With these strategies and objectives in place, Guyton's staff members believe that their students will demonstrate sufficient gains to be able to withdraw from the Chapter 1 program and achieve success in a regular classroom setting.

Program Improvement at Williams Community School, Flint

The Chapter 1 school program improvement activities scheduled for Williams Community School are multifaceted. First, the program focuses on helping children succeed in school. The primary target audience consists of those students who did not meet the achievement criteria of one NCE gain in basic skills, advanced skills, and desired outcomes in either reading or mathematics. The secondary target audience is the profes-

sional staffs. Both compensatory and regular teaching staff members are receiving special training. Chapter 1 parents are also receiving training in working with their children.

Special activities have included a summer institute for mathematics teachers, support staff demonstrations on base ten and using calculators, parent training sessions, and breakfasts with regular staff and Chapter 1 staff.

Ongoing activities include use of a materials center set up in Chapter 1 math and reading rooms where regular staff members may check out materials for use in their classrooms. The Chapter 1 social services field worker holds 20-minute sessions on self-esteem with math and reading students. The program at Williams serves approximately 300 students, including preschoolers.

Minnesota

Chapter 1 Participation and Funding Summary

Participation Levels in School Year (SY) 1989-90

Number of Children Served:	65,003
Number and Percentage of School Districts Receiving Chapter 1 Assistance:	427; 99%
Number and Percentage of Schools Receiving Chapter 1 Assistance:	941; 63%

Chapter 1 Services by Grade Span in SY 1989-90

Preschool	0%
Kindergarten	11%
Grades 1-3	60%
Grades 4-6	23%
Grades 7-12	6%

State Funding Levels by School Year

Formula Grants Allocation SY 1990-91, 1991-92:	$55,234,446; $62,601,845
Formula Grants Allocation SY 1992-93:	$67,214,878
Chapter 1 Per Pupil Expenditure SY 1990-91:	$671
Program Improvement Allocation SY 1991-92, 1992-93:	$155,843; $253,053

Chapter 1 Program Improvement Summary

Number of Schools in Program Improvement in SY 1991-92

Total Number of Schools in Program Improvement:	164
Percentage of Chapter 1 Schools in Program Improvement:	17%
Number of Schools in Joint Planning:	1

Statewide Minimum Standards for Improvement: At least 55 percent of Chapter 1 students meeting desired outcomes for basic and advanced skills in each of the skill areas served, and an average test score gain in grades 2-6 of at least one normal curve equivalent (NCE) gain or at least 51 percent of all Chapter 1 students served in grades 2-6 achieving a positive NCE gain (both requirements apply to each skill area served in both basic and advanced skills).

Chapter 1 Program Improvement

Leveraging Accountability and Higher Performance

The State Chapter 1 Office, through technical assistance and workshops, encourages local education agencies (LEAs) to view program improvement as an opportunity for program reform and transformation. The state education agency (SEA) believes that the Chapter 1 program can be a catalyst for change.

The program improvement plan requires that aggregate achievement gains and achievement in desired outcomes be used to identify schools for program improvement. Aggregate gains are required to fulfill statutory requirements. Desired outcomes are required because the Minnesota Department of Education has endorsed the implementation of Outcome-Based Education (OBE) statewide. This initiative is supported by the Legislature and the State Board of Education. The Minnesota Chapter 1 Office encourages districts to adapt their district learner outcomes by grade and subject areas for use as their Chapter 1 desired outcomes. When correctly implemented, shared use of outcomes helps to ensure that curriculum and instruction in Chapter 1 programs are aligned with the regular education program. Achievement of desired outcomes, which are closely tied to local curriculum and instruction, can serve as a good indicator of program success.

A committee charged with recommending assessment standards is currently reviewing alternatives such as portfolios, criterion-referenced tests, and ways to measure higher order thinking skills. Chapter 1 SEA and LEA staff and a representative from the Committee of Practitioners (COP) have acted as a resource to this committee to ensure that the needs of the Chapter 1 program are considered.

The Minnesota State Department of Education strongly supports program improvement because it requires that states set standards and hold schools accountable for the learning of at-risk children. Disadvantaged students have a right to quality services and a challenging curriculum. All too often, expectations for these students are set low, emphasis is on remediation, and no attention is paid to higher order thinking skills. Program improvement has the potential for revamping such ineffective practices.

Statewide Technical Assistance

The SEA currently provides technical assistance in the form of workshops, individual technical assistance from SEA staff, and printed materials. Four two-day workshops are conducted with the assistance of the Technical Assistance Center (TAC). Schools identified for program improvement must bring a

team of school-level staff members to the workshop. Teams consist of the principal, classroom teachers, Chapter 1 staff, and parents. Teams participate in activities designed to assess the ways various components of their Chapter 1 programs connect Chapter 1 to the regular classroom. Each team develops a plan that includes goals, objectives, and timelines. Workshop presentations focus on research, problem solving, advanced skills, and staff development.

In order to reduce any negative stigma associated with program improvement, all SEA communication regarding program improvement present the process as an opportunity for schools to use additional funds to evaluate the effectiveness of their programs and implement needed changes. SEA area directors work closely with identified schools in their regions to assist them in the development of their program improvement plans. Completed plans are submitted to the SEA and reviewed by staff. Monitoring is ongoing and continues throughout the implementation of the plan.

Exiting Program Improvement

According to the SEA, out of sixty-six schools which were identified in the 1989-90 testing cycle, twenty-five, or 38 percent, tested out of program improvement. The SEA estimates that about half exited because of their program improvement plans and half as the result of fluctuations in test data unrelated to student learning gains. The SEA encourages schools that test out of program improvement to implement their plans anyway.

Joint LEA/SEA Plans

At present, Minnesota has one school identified for a joint LEA/SEA plan. The process required that district and school personnel be notified of their status and participate in meetings with SEA staff to review the process and the previous plan. A new plan was developed with help from the SEA; it is in the process of being implemented. The area director responsible for the district will monitor the implementation process. Joint SEA/LEA plans focus on the process the school used to develop and implement their previous plan. The SEA finds that many schools fail to allow for the time and staff development needed to create changes.

Funding for Program Improvement

Approximately 70 percent of program improvement funds have been used for mini-grants to LEAs. Funds were also used to support the four two-day workshops the SEA conducted as part of the technical assistance provided to identified schools. In addition, approximately 25 percent of state administrative time is used on program improvement activities. Approximately 15 percent of this time is supported by state administrative funds. As more schools are identified, time spent on program improvement will increase.

Increasing Capacity for School Improvement

Given additional funds, the SEA would probably add SEA staff members who would work only with program improvement schools or identify staff in regional service centers who could work with program improvement schools. Qualifications for these additional staff members would require that they have experience and training in designing appropriate coordinated instruction, establishing learner outcomes, selecting appropriate performance assessment measures, and planning and conducting staff development. Funds would also strengthen the state's abilities to provide more timely evaluation results and assist LEAs on data analysis and appropriate use of evaluation results.

Additional Chapter 1 Innovation and Reform

Schoolwide Projects

Number of schoolwide projects in Minnesota by school year:

1989-90: 2
1990-91: 2
1991-92: 11

Five schools were eligible for schoolwide projects in school year 1990-91. Beginning with the 1989-90 school year, the SEA contacted identified schools to review the schoolwide project concept and to encourage a meeting between the SEA and school to discuss participation.

Disadvantaged students have a right to quality services and a challenging curriculum.

The concept of schoolwide projects was reviewed with the COP this year. Based on information gained from a conference sponsored by the U.S. Department of Education on schoolwide projects, site visits, and evaluation data from the projects in the state, the COP endorsed a new process for schoolwide projects. The new process provides eligible sites at least six months of time prior to implementation for activities that include planning, in-service training, and establishing evaluation requirements. The SEA and the COP believe that this planning time helps promote the intent of the schoolwide concept and ensure success.

The SEA will continue to provide technical assistance to schools in the developmental stages of schoolwide projects. Schools identified will be required to attend an all-day workshop on the components of schoolwide projects that they must address in their plan. Area directors will review and approve plans that meet the established criteria.

The SEA makes the following esti-

mates of the number of schools that would be eligible for schoolwide projects if the low-income eligibility threshold were reduced from 75 percent to the following levels: 79 schools at 60 percent, 167 schools at 50 percent, and 286 schools at 40 percent.

Coordination with the Regular Classroom

During the past two years, Minnesota school districts have begun to move steadily toward total in-class, or as more widely known, total inclusion models. Chapter 1 has taken the position that the model needs to be flexible and designed around the needs of students. The program also views an all in-class model as no better or worse than an all pull-out model.

Statewide Coordination

In an effort to encourage schools to examine their programs carefully, identify their strengths and weaknesses, and develop program models that coordinate all support services (i.e., Chapter 1, migrant education, English-as-a-second language, special education) with the regular classroom, the SEA, in conjunction with the TAC, is working with twelve pilot sites to develop coordinated models other sites can duplicate. Teams from twelve buildings, representing urban and rural districts, have been working together for the past year. The SEA has also funded three two-day workshops. SEA staff members from Chapter 1, migrant education, and programs for LEP students have been assigned to work with the sites. While data and information are preliminary at this time, site visits and observations to review the status of their coordination plans indicate that leadership is critical in order for change to take place. Equally important, however, are the teams' abilities to develop a plan and process for implementation.

Coordination with the regular classroom and the development of quality learner outcomes have become focal points for monitoring and compliance reviews for SEA staff. During site visits and the review of program applications, special attention is given to these areas. As the state continues to advance toward statewide implementation of OBE, Chapter 1 programs will be aligned with state standards and assessment procedures as they relate to performance-based assessment.

Making a Difference School by School

Program Improvement at Slayton Public School, Slayton

Slayton Public Schools was identified for participation in the program improvement process based on 1989-90 evaluation data. As a first step in developing a program improvement plan, a team of staff members from the school attended a twelve-hour workshop conducted by the Minnesota Department of Education. The workshop included training on the characteristics of effective schools, a guided assessment of the school Chapter 1 project designed to identify areas of strength and weakness, and a structured process for developing a plan.

The goal of the Slayton School plan is to help students become more successful readers through improved reading instruction. The objectives of the plan are: to provide instruction to regular and Chapter 1 staff on learning styles, curricular modifications for students with special needs, comprehension strategies, and higher orderthinking skills; to develop and maintain a reading portfolio for each Chapter 1 student; to supplement the existing basal reading program with quality literature; and to incorporate written language activities into reading instruction.

The following steps have been taken or are being developed to implement these objectives: in-service on learning styles, curriculum modifications, written language and comprehension strategies; development of reading portfolios for all Chapter 1 students; completion of the Chapter 1 Supplemental Reading Inventory; and publication of a Chapter 1 newsletter.

District staff reports that implementation of the plan has had a significant effect on the entire reading program in the school.

Mississippi

Chapter 1 Participation and Funding Summary

Participation Levels in School Year (SY) 1990-91

Number of Children Served:	170,786
Percentage of K-12 Children Served:	34%
Number and Percentage of School Districts Receiving Chapter 1 Assistance:	153; 100%
Number and Percentage of Schools Receiving Chapter 1 Assistance:	749; 88%

Chapter 1 Services by Grade Span in SY 1990-91

Preschool	1%
Kindergarten	3%
Grades 1-3	23%
Grades 4-6	42%
Grades 7-12	31%

State Funding Levels by School Year

Formula Grants Allocation SY 1990-91, 1991-92:	$93,466,026; $109,345,973
Formula Grants Allocation SY 1992-93:	$120,288, 820
Chapter 1 Per Pupil Expenditure SY 1990-91:	$550
Program Improvement Allocation SY 1991-92, 1992-93:	$261,333; $435,374

Chapter 1 Program Improvement Summary

Number of Schools in Program Improvement in SY 1991-92

Total Number of Schools in Program Improvement:	482
Percentage of Chapter 1 Schools in Program Improvement:	60%
Number of Schools in Joint Planning:	287

Statewide Mimimum Standards for Improvement —An absolute minimum of one normal curve equivalent (NCE) gain with the following NCE minimums by grade: grades 2-3, reading/language arts, minimum of 2 NCEs; grades 4-6, reading/language arts/math, minimum of 2 NCEs; grades 7-9 reading/language arts, minimum of 1 NCE; grades 7-9 math, minimum of 2 NCEs; and grades 10-12 reading/language arts, minimum of 2 NCEs. The desired outcomes are set locally by each district. The majority of the standards must be met in each building.

Chapter 1 Program Improvement

Leveraging Accountability and Higher Performance

The Mississippi Department of Education believes that if schools are to be held accountable, partnerships between the state education agency (SEA) and local education agencies (LEAs) and between the LEA and the school are critical. Performance monitoring identifies children and schools not making adequate gains. Once children and schools are identified as needing assistance, both human and technical resources must be available to help assess program weaknesses and implement needed changes.

Statewide Technical Assistance

Once identified for improvement, schools are provided technical assistance by the SEA in the form of on-site visits, which are full-day extensive reviews of program quality based on Effective Schools research. The SEA also provides district, regional, and statewide workshops to increase program emphasis on the development of advanced skills and the adoption of successful models. In addition, district, school, and regional inservice training is provided.

During all SEA-sponsored workshops and on-site visits, the SEA encourages and assists schools in establishing effective locally determined desired outcomes.

From the beginning, SEA staff has presented program improvement as a positive concept. Superintendents, coordinators, principals, and school teams are invited to statewide workshops to foster LEA cooperation in the program improvement process and to become more aware of program improvement as an opportunity. School faculty meetings and district workshops conducted by SEA program improvement staff continue to strengthen program improvement.

Exiting Program Improvement

Although an aberration in test scores greatly affected the testing out numbers, program improvement efforts have had a positive affect on programs as well. The SEA encourages schools that exit program improvement before fully implementing their plans to continue in the program improvement process. The SEA also recommends schools consider implementing the process whether the school has been identified for program improvement or not.

Joint SEA/LEA Plans

For those schools that need to develop joint plans, districts are required to submit revised plans (by building) to the SEA for review. The SEA provides these schools with technical assistance in the form of on-site program reviews, joint as-

sessment of attributes, observations, commendations, and recommendations for program improvement.

Program improvement funds will continue to be used for joint planning. In spring and summer, representatives from identified schools will take part in intensive staff development instruction to provide team training and ongoing accountability measures for participating schools. Due to strong encouragement by the SEA, statewide team efforts have been implemented by many schools.

Funding for Program Improvement

Seventy-five percent of the 1989-90 program improvement allocation was used for mini-grants and 25 percent for SEA technical assistance. Overprescriptive restraints on local planning and the use of funds statewide slow the expenditure of program improvement funds in Mississippi.

Two full-time program improvement supervisors, one half-time evaluation specialist, and one half-time secretary administer the Chapter 1 program improvement plan. As a result of increased attention devoted to program improvement, approximately 15 percent of other Chapter 1 administrative activities have been cut back. A portion of the Chapter 1 monitoring checklist for compliance deals with program improvement; however, the intensive review of program improvement plans, implementation practices, technical assistance, and on-site program quality reviews require full-time staff.

Increasing Capacity for School Improvement

Additional statewide funds would be used to conduct hands-on workshops, more intensive field work, more team work on-site, and more assistance with implementing alternative means of instructional delivery.

Additional Chapter 1 Innovation and Reform

Schoolwide Projects

Number of schools in Mississippi operating schoolwide projects by school year:

1989-90	32
1990-91	84
1991-92	139

Three hundred schools were eligible for Chapter 1 schoolwide projects in the 1990-91 school year.

To encourage the development and implementation of schoolwide projects, schoolwide project conferences were held in 1989-90 and again in 1990-91. Attendance at both conferences exceeded 250 persons with most districts with schools eligible for schoolwide projects participating. Schoolwide projects are also featured at state Chapter 1 conferences and information on national schoolwide project conferences is disseminated to school districts. Five Chapter 1 regional supervisors provide technical assistance

For schools implementing schoolwide projects, the SEA provides technical assistance through on-site visits. This guidance includes review of program implementation, program improvement, and compliance with maintenance of effort issues.

Curriculum changes have not generally occurred in schoolwide projects. Instructional changes have included heavy reliance and extensive involvement in computer-assisted instruction.

There is grave concern on the maintenance of effort issue. Last year state funding for education was cut by 5 percent and another cut has been recommended. At least four school districts have already elected to discontinue established schoolwide projects, and one is in the process of doing so. The maintenance of effort requirements are carefully monitored and districts are advised of requirements for meeting the 100 percent continued expenditures. Other than those districts that have elected to discontinue the projects, no others have currently been identified as being ineligible to continue.

Approximately half the districts will be involved in program improvement during the three-year period of the projects.

The SEA estimates the following number of schools would qualify for schoolwide projects if the low-income eligibility threshold were reduced from 75 percent to the following levels: 472 schools at 60 percent, 607 schools at 50 percent, and 700 schools at 40 percent.

Coordination with the Regular Classroom

Many schools are incorporating cooperative learning as a teaching strategy and cooperative teaching as a greater commitment to stronger programs for children. Positive results are convincing teachers that coordination is worth the extra effort.

The SEA discusses options available to LEAs for coordinating Chapter 1 services with the regular classroom teacher. Most of the projects include components that directly impact the regular classroom and the regular classroom teacher. This effect is seen through reduced class size, reliance on schoolwide computer-assisted instructional labs, enhanced staff development, and districtwide in-service.

In-service opportunities are provided through statewide conferences that have included components on coordination of regular and Chapter 1 programs. Program improvement conferences have also included in-service components.

Statewide Coordination

Chapter 1 could be used in conjunction with the state's accreditation procedures for identifying schools that need improving. Because many of these schools are eligible for schoolwide projects, the improvement could be accomplished through comprehensive use of Chapter 1 funds. State-funded regional service officers have been trained to understand requirements for schoolwide projects. These officers work with Chapter 1 area supervisors to coordinate the improvement efforts of both state and Chapter 1

initiatives. Separate program improvement efforts are maintained by state accreditation and Chapter 1.

To streamline the administrative requirements at the local level, the SEA is working to transfer most data collection to computer systems. Information required of LEAs is screened to determine if the information is available from other sources and if the information is required by statute or regulation. The state maintains careful inventory of use of data collected and minimizes paperwork.

The SEA encourages the use of Chapter 1 funds for preschool programs through discussions with local school district superintendents and Chapter 1 coordinators. No efforts exist to coordinate Chapter 1 and Head Start, though this area has been identified as a goal to improve implementation of preschool programs in local districts.

For coordinating Chapter 1, special education, and bilingual education funds, the state provides the LEAs the guidance set out by the regulations and the Chapter 1 Policy Manual. The selection of limited-English-proficient (LEP) students for Chapter 1 services is based on identification of the student for educational problems and not language problems. Students most often identified for both LEP and Chapter 1 services are provided instruction through Chapter 1 basic and migrant programs. There is limited use of bilingual aides with LEP students.

Special education students are served when both special education and mainstream requirements are met. If a student is learning disabled in one basic subject area only, the student may be served in another basic subject Chapter 1 program.

Making a Difference School by School

Schoolwide Project at Prentiss Elementary School, Jefferson Davis County

Prentiss Elementary School is currently operating a schoolwide program. It is the mission of this school to ensure that all students have the opportunity to maximize their potential and become contributing members of society. The realization that more than three-fourths of the students come from socio-economically deprived homes prompted the school to look closely at the effect that this deprivation was having on all students. Further assessment of needs indicated that all students could benefit from supplemental aid and services provided through Chapter 1 funding.

Once children and schools are identified as needing assistance, both human and technical resources must be available to help assess program weaknesses and implement needed changes.

It was necessary to reorganize the delivery of Chapter 1 services to meet identified needs of students. Because the overall goal is to improve the achievement level of students, the following specific objectives were set: provide computer-assisted instruction in basic skills remediation, remove the stigma associated with the labeling of Chapter 1 students, devise ways to improve parental input and involvement, enhance the basic staff development program, and increase the students' scores on the norm-referenced tests.

Program Improvement at Oak Park Elementary, Laurel School District

One school benefiting from Chapter 1 program improvement is Oak Park Elementary in Laurel, Mississippi. Oak Park is in Phase II of program improvement. During the 1991-92 school year, a team of administrators, teachers, assistants, parents, and students worked together to create a positive learning climate to improve student achievement. Parent and community involvement has increased as parent volunteers help on a daily basis with hall duty, lunchroom duty, and bus duty . A group called MEN of Oak Park School encourages fathers, grandfathers, and community leaders to volunteer time at the school. The local chapter of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) sponsors a special mentorship program.

A Chapter 1 Parent Center offers materials and staff to help parents help their children with schoolwork. The Center is open after school and on Saturdays for parent training sessions in homework assistance and skills reinforcement. This year, Chapter 1 presented sixteen training sessions (Success-N-Schools) for parents who are employed at a local plant. The company released the parents from their jobs and paid them to attend the sessions at the plant.

Students and parents attend after-school computer lab classes for one hour once a week. Parents help their children, or work to improve their own basic skills, using tutorial software in reading, language, and math.

In addition, a full-time Chapter 1 guidance counselor works with students, parents, and staff to improve student self-esteem, discipline, and achievement. A Chapter 1 assistant teacher works with individuals and small groups of students to improve reading and math skills. Chapter 1 staff development training is offered on learning styles, critical thinking skills, teacher expectations, and student achievement. A networked computer lab with twenty-five stations has been added to improve reading and math.

Missouri

Chapter 1 Participation and Funding Summary

Participation Levels in School Year (SY) 1990-91

Number of Children Served:	93,931
Percentage of K-12 Children Served:	27%
Number and percentage of School Districts Receiving Chapter 1 Assistance:	470; 87%

Chapter 1 Services by Grade Span in SY 1990-91

Preschool	4%
Kindergarten	8%
Grades 1-3	49%
Grades 4-6	31%
Grades 7-12	8%

State Funding Levels by School Year

Formula Grants Allocation SY 1990-91, 1991-92:	$75,379,565; $88,675,844
Formula Grants Allocation SY 1992-1993:	$103,059,332
Chapter 1 Per Pupil Expenditure SY 1990-91:	$964
Program Improvement Allocation SY 1991-92, 1992-93:	$226,414; $376,014

Chapter 1 Program Improvement Summary

Number of Schools in Program Improvement in SY 1991-92

Total Number of Schools in Program Improvement:	253
Percentage of Chapter 1 Schools in Program Improvement:	50%
Number of Schools in Joint Planning:	0

Statewide Minimum Standards for Improvement –One normal curve equivalent (NCE) gain in basic and advanced skills and substantial progress toward meeting desired outcomes.

Chapter 1 Program Improvement

Leveraging Accountability and Higher Performance

Missouri Chapter 1 schools are accountable for improving the education of at-risk children. When learning gains are not evidenced through standardized test results and desired outcomes, schools are required to begin program improvement. Staff receive professional development, assess the strengths and weaknesses of their programs, and develop a plan to improve the education of their Chapter 1 students.

Approximately 35 percent of local education agencies (LEAs) in Missouri have established aggregate achievement objectives that exceed the state minimum standard.

Statewide Technical Assistance

Emphasis on advanced skills in other desired outcomes by the state education agency (SEA) encourages the adoption of successful models. The SEA addresses the importance of desired outcomes indicative of student progress during program improvement seminars and other in-services. The SEA encourages teachers to take ownership of their desired outcomes and sends back for revisions applications with inadequate desired outcomes.

Schools in the program improvement process use parent involvement activities, substitutes for released time for coordination, and resource centers.

Coordination with the Regular Classroom

The SEA encourages LEAs to provide Chapter 1 services in the regular classroom and coordinate services with the regular classroom teacher through release time during the day and after school for stipend pay.

The SEA provides writing workshops and program improvement seminars for regular classroom teachers to better teach Chapter 1 children in the regular classroom.

Exiting Program Improvement

Thirty percent of schools identified for program improvement during the 1989-90 testing cycle tested out of the program before fully implementing their program improvement plans. However, those who tested out after partial implementation still completed the program improvement process. By conducting program improvement seminars, the SEA encourages schools that exit program improvement before fully implementing their plans to continue in the program improvement process.

Funding for Program Improvement

As of February 1, 1992, the SEA had distributed 50 percent of 1990-91 program improvement funds. Sixty percent of the program improvement money is being used for mini-grants to LEAs rather than direct SEA technical assistance. Sixty percent of state administration staff time is devoted to responsibilities for Chapter 1 program improvement with 25 percent of state technical assistance in program improvement supported by state administrative funds.

The monitoring activities of Chapter 1 administrative staff have been cut back as the result of increased attention devoted to program improvement. A program improvement monitoring form is used to coordinate Chapter 1 monitoring and compliance requirements with Chapter 1 program improvement funds.

Increasing Capacity for School Improvement

All Chapter 1 supervisors work in districts in their region to develop, monitor, and evaluate program improvement plans. Additional support staff would be helpful to the whole program improvement operation.

Additional Chapter 1 Innovation and Reform

Schoolwide Projects

Number of schoolwide projects in Missouri by school year:

1989-90:	3
1990-91:	5
1991-92:	10

Thirty-nine schools in the state were eligible for Chapter 1 schoolwide projects during the 1990-91 school year.

The SEA encourages the development and implementation of schoolwide projects in the state by sending members of LEAs with eligible schools to schoolwide conferences that overview the benefits of schoolwide programs.

The SEA provides technical assistance to schools implementing schoolwide projects through monitoring, evaluation, and technical assistance.

Staff receive professional development, assess the strengths and weaknesses of their program, and develop a plan to improve the education of their Chapter 1 students.

The greatest benefit of schoolwide projects is that the school can focus entirely on the whole instructional program, rather than on only one segment of the school population through pull-out models of instruction.

The SEA makes the following estimates of the number of schools that would be eligible for schoolwide projects if the low-income eligibility threshold were reduced from the 75 percent to the following levels: 100 schools at 60 percent, 150 schools at 50 percent, and 300 schools at 40 percent.

Statewide Coordination

Chapter 1 monitoring is coordinated with state school improvement programs. Additionally, Project Construct support is used to aid statewide efforts to coordinate Chapter 1 with Head Start and other programs to aid disadvantaged students.

The state provides guidance to LEAs about ways to coordinate Chapter 1, state compensatory education, special education, and bilingual education funds through technical assistance at the local level. With respect to special education, LEAs can provide Chapter 1 services to children with mild disabilities if the services are supplemental to the Individualized Educational Plan (IEP).

Making a Difference School by School

Schoolwide project at Williamson Kennedy Elementary School, Poplar Bluff

Williamson Kennedy Elementary School implemented a schoolwide project during the 1991-92 school year. The primary focus of the program was on the discipline problems that seemed to carry over from the playground into instructional time. The program includes directed activity on the playground, organized with physical education. Chapter 1 funds were used to employ a Physical Education teacher.

Program Improvement at Fox C-6 School District, Arnold

This LEA did partial implementation in spring 1991. They made tremendous NCE gains (+10) but still continued with full implementation into the 1991-92 school year. Their program improvement plan focused primarily on coordination among classroom teachers, Chapter 1 teachers, and parents.

Montana

Chapter 1 Participation and Funding Summary

Participation Levels in School Year (SY) 1990-91

Number of Children Served:	13,801
Percentage of K-12 Children Served:	5%
Number and Percentage of School Districts Receiving Chapter 1 Assistance:	313; 84%
Number and Percentage of Schools Receiving Chapter 1 Assistance:	581; 64%

Chapter 1 Services by Grade Span in SY 1990-91

Preschool	<1%
Kindergarten	2%
Grades 1-3	30%
Grades 4-6	26%
Grades 7-12	41%

State Funding Levels by School Year

Formula Grants Allocation SY 1990-91, 1991-92:	$13,221,188; $14,337,183
Formula Grants Allocation SY 1992-93:	$16,622,171
Chapter 1 Per Pupil Expenditure SY 1990-91:	$985
Program Improvement Allocation SY 1991-92; 1992-93:	$90,000; $180,000

Chapter 1 Program Improvement Summary

Number of Schools in Program Improvement in SY 1991-92

Total Number of Schools in Program Improvement:	29
Percentage of Chapter 1 Schools in Program Improvement:	5%
Number of Schools in Joint Planning:	3

Statewide Minimum Standards for Improvement–Greater than zero normal curve equivalent (NCE) gain and substantial progress in achieving desired outcomes for more than 50 percent of students served.

Chapter 1 Program Improvement

Leveraging Accountability and Higher Performance

Chapter 1 program improvement has given Montana's Chapter 1 programs an opportunity to assess in-depth their existing services. Many of the schools wish that they had undertaken this type of review years ago. Program improvement is not a punitive concept, but one that seeks to transform unsuccessful programs and help good ones become better. The longer schools participate in program improvement, the more they like it. It offers a framework to institutionalize what the state education agency (SEA) and districts were already doing—applying Effective Schools research to improve practice. Most programs in Montana are enthusiastic about participation in the process and some schools not identified for improvement have volunteered to participate in the process.

The SEA is not currently in the process of raising the minimum standard. If the standard were to be raised, the SEA would not have the staff or funding resources to provide the technical assistance schools would need to participate successfully in program improvement.

Statewide Technical Assistance

The SEA has provided workshops at the last two annual conferences to encourage and assist schools in establishing effective locally-determined desired outcomes in addition to measuring NCE gains on norm-referenced tests.

The SEA provides regional workshops, on-site consultations, and facilitates assistance by the Technical Assistance Center (TAC) and Rural Technical Assistance Center (RTAC) to schools identified for improvement. The SEA provides information to program improvement teams concerning the development of advanced skills and the adoption of successful models at annual conference workshops and in the state program improvement guide.

The SEA has endeavored to keep its approach to program improvement as positive as possible. Staff from identified schools are treated with respect and the process is described by the SEA as "your golden opportunity to make your program everything you've ever wished it could be."

Successful Models

Innovative curriculum models and instructional strategies have been adopted in several districts. Among these are the Higher Order Thinking Skills Program (HOTS), the Cognet Program, Math Their Way, Decision-Making Math, and other National Diffusion Network (NDN) programs. Increased efforts in coordination and parent involvement have been the focus for several projects. MegaSkills training was attended by many parents in March of 1992. Some districts have contracted with university staff for on-site in-service.

Exiting Program Improvement

The SEA encourages schools that exit program improvement before fully implementing their plans to continue in the program improvement process if plans have been submitted, funds committed, and implementation begun. These schools are encouraged to proceed with implementation with approved funds.

Joint SEA/LEA Plans

The first step in the joint planning process is the attendance of each school-level team at a regional workshop to re-examine the first plan and consider what might be done differently. The school-staff team is always given the lead in the joint planning process. Next, a series of four on-site meetings are conducted. Some SEA staff attends the first and last meetings. The first meeting includes the development of a planning process, and the second and third provide time for the team to work on what they wish to include in the plan. The fourth meeting is to finalize the joint plan by bringing the team's recommendations together with SEA guidance and input. Technical assistance provided includes the workshops and on-site meetings, as well as other types of assistance the team may identify.

Assistance may range from TAC/RTAC in-service to in-service provided by contracting with university staff or other training providers. Program improvement funds will be available and approved for appropriate activities until all available funds have been committed. All SEA support is provided from state administration funds. TAC/RTAC negotiated on-site days are used as needed and as appropriate. Schools in joint planning will not be targeted for any special priority in the approval of funds but rather will be approved for funds on the same basis as first-year or second-year schools. All three of Montana's joint planning schools have already received considerable amounts of funds for program improvement activities.

Funding for Program Improvement

The SEA has distributed 96 percent of the 1990-91 program improvement funds. On the whole, the SEA Chapter 1 office devotes at least 25 percent of staff time to program improvement, with the lead specialist spending 50 percent of her time on program improvement activities. With increased responsibilities for program improvement and inadequate resources, the SEA has delayed some on-site monitoring of the state's Chapter 1 projects. SEA staff try to coordinate program improvement site visits with monitoring visits in the same geographical region, where possible.

Additional Chapter 1 Innovation and Reform

Schoolwide Pojects

Montana does not have any schoolwide projects in operation. According to the U.S. Department of Education, Montana had thirty-five schools eligible for schoolwide projects in the 1990-91 school year. There have been no schoolwide projects in Montana since 1989-90. The only schoolwide project in the state had to be discontinued due to problems with maintenance of effort.

The SEA makes the following estimation of the number of schools that would be eligible for schoolwide projects if the low-income eligibility threshold were lowered from 75 percent to the following levels: 58 schools at 60 percent, 103 schools at 50 percent, 157 schools at 40 percent.

Without adequate resources, program improvement will fail in its mission of helping schools implement needed changes and instead will stigmatize low-performing schools.

Increasing Capacity for School Improvement

Current resources of $90,000 per year have not been enough to fund every LEA request. It is hoped that the $180,000 that has been approved for FY 93 will help alleviate this problem and prevent schools from being discouraged by not receiving adequate funds to implement the plans they have so diligently developed.

At the state level, additional funds are needed to provide more assistance to schools once they are identified for program improvement. The SEA would like to support regional networks of schools undergoing improvement and raise the standard for program improvement. If the standard is raised, more schools will be identified as needing assistance. Without adequate resources, program improvement will fail its mission of helping schools implement needed changes and instead will stigmatize low-performing schools.

Coordination with the Regular Classroom

The SEA encourages local education agencies (LEAs) to provide Chapter 1 services in the regular classroom and to coordinate services with the regular classroom teacher through: the dissemination of reports that promote and feature in-class services, a series of RTAC workshops in 1990-91 on coordination, training sessions at the annual conference on in-class models and coordination, and encouragement to use a Cooperative Teaching Plan (CTP) when serving students in the regular classroom.

Statewide Coordination

Many school districts have reported that the Chapter 1 program improvement process has been an impetus for overall school improvement. The Montana Board of Public Education requires the reporting of norm-referenced test scores at grades 3, 8 and 11. The tests and reporting for this state requirement match the Chapter 1 requirements.

The SEA provided information at the annual conference and in the quarterly newsletter to make LEAs more aware of their options in the area of preschool programs serving disadvantaged students. The SEA recommends selecting limited-English-proficient (LEP) students using the federal requirement to identify according to needs stemming from educational deprivation not solely related to LEP. The SEA bilingual/LEP staff present information at the annual conference.

If all requirements of the Individualized Education Plan (IEP) are met with state and local funds, and these students are selected on the same basis as other students, special education students may receive additional services from Chapter 1.

Each year the SEA updates and revises the required application and evaluation forms in order to streamline administrative paperwork requirements at the local level.

Making a Difference School by School

Program Improvement at Quentin Brown Primary School, Corvallis

The Program Improvement Planning (PIP) team at Quentin Brown Primary School used research-based literature and formal and informal surveys of staff and parents to diagnosis problems and determine the best way to improve their program.

One of the first weaknesses the team discovered was the lack of continuity in the reading program and an over-emphasis on isolated skills. To counteract this imbalance, the Chapter 1 staff and classroom teachers will work on an effective transition from one basal to the other and a coordination of the phonics program. The team will also set goals and objectives for a developmentally appropriate reading core curriculum that allows for the continual progress of each child.

In-service training in effective reading practices will help reach the goals by providing a common base of knowledge of various reading practices and approaches. The staff has an average of fifteen years experience in the Quentin Brown Primary School. By using the many years of experience and expertise to work together in the development of a common reading curriculum, the school will provide each student with an opportunity for reading success.

Research strongly supports the hypothesis that parents are influential in promoting the reading achievement of their children. Surveys of parents and staff of the school also provide evidence that there is a need to reach out to parents and care providers of children, ages birth to 4th grade. Thus, the PIP team will ensure that parents are included in the process of developing and implementing the goals and objectives of the reading curriculum.

The PIP team also hopes to increase parent involvement and student achievement by evaluating and upgrading a home reading program. During home visits to parents, Chapter 1 staff will deliver packets containing activities to do at home, books to read, and supplies such as pencils and markers. Books and tape recorders will be available for parents to check out. A series of five parent workshops will be conducted by the school psychologist, Chapter 1 teachers, and the communtiy health worker.

Nebraska

Chapter 1 Participation and Funding Summary

Participation Levels in School Year (SY) 1990-91

Number of Children Served:	27,218
Percentage of K-12 Children Served:	9%
Number and Percentage of School Districts Receiving Chapter 1 Assistance:	322; 41%
Number and Percentage of Schools Receiving Chapter 1 Assistance:	561; 32%

Chapter 1 Services by Grade Span in SY 1990-91

Preschool	1%
Kindergarten	3%
Grades 1-3	50%
Grades 4-6	35%
Grades 7-12	11%

State Funding Levels by School Year

Formula Grants Allocation SY 1990-91, 1991-92:	$22,509,710; $24,739,701
Formula Grants Allocation SY 1992-93:	$ 28,535,457
Chapter 1 Per Pupil Expenditure SY 1990-91:	$846
Program Improvement Allocation SY 1991-92, 1992-93:	$90,000; $180,000

Chapter 1 Program Improvement Summary

Number of Schools in Program Improvement in SY 1991-92

Total Number of Schools in Program Improvement:	180
Percentage of Chapter 1 Schools in Program Improvement:	32%
Number of Schools in Joint Planning:	3

Statewide Minimum Standards for Improvement –A normal curve equivalent (NCE) gain greater than zero for grades 2-12 and below grade 2, a desired outcome per instructional area and grade level that must be based on mastering skills that all children are expected to learn at that level.

Chapter 1 Program Improvement

Leveraging Accountability and Higher Performance

The strong support of Chapter 1 program improvement by the Nebraska State Board of Education and the Commissioner of Education has been a driving force for school districts to consider implementing school improvement strategies for the entire district. The outcome of program improvement is going to be an increase in the quality of education. Chapter 1 program improvement also supports High Performance Learning, a statewide model for redesigning education in Nebraska.

The Committee of Practitioners (COP) reviewed a proposal in March of 1992 to raise minimum gains incrementally to three NCEs and require an additional desired outcome, not based on standardized test scores, for each instructional area in grades 2-12 by the 1993-94 school year. The COP initially endorsed a minimum standard until information became available to support higher statewide standards.

Statewide Technical Assistance

The state education agency (SEA) has provided regional presentations on establishing desired outcomes. Additional guidance is provided in the *LEA Evaluation Guide* and the Chapter 1 Information Letter. In March of 1992, the SEA recommended to the COP that all local education agencies (LEAs) be required to establish desired outcomes based on the achievement that is expected of all students in grades 2-12. These desired outcomes must be measured using assessments other than standardized test scores.

The SEA encourages all schools in Nebraska to incorporate the Chapter 1 staff and program as an integral part of their schoolwide and districtwide improvement plans. School and/or district plans are not mandated, but the number of these plans is increasing annually. Chapter 1 programs that develop their own improvement plans are encouraged to review and update the plan as a part of the Local Annual Review.

The Technical Assistance Center (TAC) provides TAC–TEAM institutes to assist local school district teams. A group of practitioners from across the state, called Peer Assistants, has been trained to provide assistance to neighboring schools. The SEA also offers annual regional meetings on program improvement, and SEA staff consult with individual districts and provide on-site assistance as requested. Program improvement is also emphasized during on-site monitoring review visits. Schools that have been identified for program improvement are encouraged to apply for the program improvement grants.

The annual spring state regional conferences include presentations by TAC staff on the development of advanced skills. The TAC is also in the process of assisting the SEA in the development of a process to disseminate information on successful models.

Part of Nebraska's High Performance Learning Model for Redesigning Education is the development of a program improvement plan. By encouraging schools to integrate the required Chapter 1 program improvement plans with the district plans, the negative connotation is neutralized.

Successful Models

Schools in program improvement are encouraged to include the services that Chapter 1 participants receive in the regular classroom as part of their self-assessment in the development of their plans. Thus, as a result of program improvement, many districts are initiating new curriculum and instructional strategies, such as whole language. A high priority was given to staff development requests in awarding the program improvement mini-grants. These activities accounted for an estimated 50 percent of the mini-grants. The SEA review of the plans submitted by LEAs, plus on-site visits, confirm that most schools are putting their greatest emphasis on coordination with the classroom and parental involvement programs.

The SEA continues to encourage LEAs to provide preschool, extended-day and other models of services. Coordination of instruction has been the topic of several articles in the Chapter 1 Information Letter. Presentations on this topic have also been conducted at SEA regional meetings. LEAs are encouraged to use program improvement funds as well as regular grant funds for training of Chapter 1 and regular classroom staff.

Joint SEA/LEA Plans

Nebraska has only three schools in the joint plan phase at this time. On-site visits were made to each school to assist in planning. In addition, the TAC is providing ongoing assistance to one of the sites. Mini-grant requests from schools in joint planning received first priority. Only one of the three schools has completed and implemented a joint SEA/LEA plan.

Chapter 1 program improvement supports High Performance Learning, a statewide model for redesigning education in Nebraska.

Funding for Program Improvement

All of the 1990-91 program improvement funds have been awarded to LEAs through mini-grants. A major problem with using these funds occurs when LEAs do fall-to-fall testing, and the identification process is not complete until mid-year. With a competitive awarding process for the mini-grants, these funds are not awarded until January. This delay severely limits the time available for use of these funds by the LEAs.

About 40 percent of SEA administrative staff time is devoted to program improvement responsibilities. On-site monitoring reviews have been most severely effected by the additional responsibilities. With 180 schools in program improvement and only three professional staff plus one administrator, the SEA is severely limited in its capacity to provide the additional services needed to assist these schools in their program improvement efforts. The review of program improvement activities at the local school districts is included in all scheduled Chapter 1 monitoring.

Increasing Capacity for School Improvement

The current level of funding for state administration is inadequate to attend to even the minimum additional activities required by program improvement. The SEA has been utilizing the TAC staff, but there are limitations to the SEA's share of their time and resources.

If additional Chapter 1 state administrative funds were available, the SEA's priority use of funds would be: (1) a full-time program improvement director to provide assistance to LEAs, work directly with LEA/SEA joint planning schools, coordinate activities, complete paperwork and provide TEAM institutes and summer training sessions, (2) a full-time staff development director to provide training for LEA staff and local directors and coordinate and arrange for more opportunities for staff development from other agencies, and (3) adequate support for these staff, including clerical assistance.

Additional Chapter 1 Innovation and Reform

Schoolwide Projects

To date, Nebraska has no schools in schoolwide projects. For 1990-91, there were only four schools eligible. Three of the four are rural. The SEA estimates that the following number of schools would be eligible for schoolwide projects if the low-income eligibility threshold were lowered from 75 percent to the following levels: 29 schools at 60 percent, 57 schools at 50 percent, and 108 schools at 40 percent.

Statewide Coordination

In Nebraska, the Chapter 1 program improvement efforts are integrated into district and schoolwide improvement plans. Chapter 2 funds in Nebraska are used, in part, to sponsor a school improvement process called A+chieving Excellence by the Mid-continent Regional Educational Laboratory (McCREL). All

schools participating in this training have been encouraged to include Chapter 1 staff in the process. Chapter 1 program improvement funds have been approved for schools in program improvement to participate in this program.

The SEA has tried to reduce paperwork at the local level through computerization of data where possible and through continual monitoring to avoid duplication of data collection. For example, schools are allowed to submit their district or school improvement plans without having to submit a special Chapter 1 form.

Only a few districts in Nebraska have Head Start programs. The LEAs are encouraged to coordinate activities and, in most cases, do work with Head Start programs in preschool assessment of need. The number of preschool programs is increasing. The SEA provides information and guidance through the Chapter 1 Information Letter and regional presentations. The State Chapter 1 Administrator serves on the statewide Early Childhood Task Force.

The State Chapter 1 office has worked within the SEA's Special Education and Equal Education Opportunity/ National Origin Project (bilingual) sections to coordinate guidance on services provided to Chapter 1 participants.

The SEA follows the guidance provided in the Chapter 1 Policy Manual regarding the selection of limited-English-proficient (LEP) children for services. The bilingual office and Chapter 1 maintain continuous dialogue and contact and work cooperatively in providing assistance to LEAs.

Nebraska's special education state guidelines for identification and provision of services have been revised recently. Many students with mild disabilities are no longer eligible to receive service in special education programs and are being served in Chapter 1. This will add new responsibilities to Chapter 1 services and may lead to increased numbers of schools identified for program improvement.

LEAs are required to include a statement on each multi-disciplinary report regarding Chapter 1 eligibility requirements and special education identification of handicapping conditions. LEAs include a description of the coordination of instruction for students served in both programs. In many cases, this includes having the Chapter 1 teacher participate in the referral, identification, and Individualized Education Plan (IEP) development process.

Making a Difference School by School

Program Improvement at Clinton Elementary, Lincoln

The Lincoln Public Schools' Chapter 1 program serves eleven public and two private elementary schools. All thirteen schools developed program improvement plans, although only five of them were required to do so. The following describes the improvement efforts at Clinton Elementary.

Clinton was identified and wrote an improvement plan during the 1990-91 school year. Initial assessment involved using the process from A+chieving Excellence (McCREL) to identify areas of need, and Chapter 1 staff participated in all phases of development of the schoolwide plan. Initial efforts focused on both improving the coordination of instruction between regular classroom and Chapter 1 programs and increasing parental involvement in the Chapter 1 program.

One change the school has made has been to focus on pre-teaching. Through a coordinated effort, classroom and Chapter 1 teachers are jointly developing instructional plans to benefit Chapter 1 participants.

Clinton Elementary is no longer in mandatory program improvement but has continued the improvements described above and extended their improvement efforts to a schoolwide project.

Nevada

Chapter 1 Participation and Funding Summary

Participation Levels in School Year (SY) 1990-91

Number of Children Served:	10,506
Percentage of K-12 Children Served:	5%
Number and Percentage of School Districts Receiving Chapter 1 Assistance:	16; 94%
Number and Percentage of Schools Receiving Chapter 1 Assistance:	99; 27%

Chapter 1 Services by Grade Span in SY 1990-91

Preschool	1%
Kindergarten	13%
Grades 1-3	29%
Grades 4-6	28%
Grades 7-12	29%

State Funding Levels by School Year

Formula Grants Allocation SY 1990-91, 1991-92::	$8,219,905; $12,115,649
Formula Grants Allocation SY 1992-93:	$14,275,522
Chapter 1 Per Pupil Expenditure SY 1990-91:	$779
Program Improvement Allocation SY 1991-92 ; 1992-93:	$90,000; $180,000

Chapter 1 Program Improvement Summary

Number of Schools in Program Improvement in SY 1991-92

Total Number of Schools in Program Improvement:	18
Percentage of Chapter 1 Schools in Program Improvement:	5%
Number of Schools in Joint Planning:	2

Statewide Minimum Standards for Improvement–One normal curve equivalent (NCE) gain in basic and advanced skills and other desired outcomes determined by the local education agency (LEA).

Chapter 1 Program Improvement

Leveraging Accountability and Higher Performance

The Nevada State Department of Education believes that once schools are in program improvement, they realize that reviewing what is actually happening in a school is a very healthy process. Review refocuses attention not only on the schools making inadequate gains, but also on the individual child. The LEAs and schools are forced to look at learning gains for at-risk children in terms of higher achievement as well as basic skills. As a result of the greater accountability, there is less of a chance that these children will become lost in the system.

The state has raised the performance standard in aggregate achievement from a positive gain to one NCE and currently seeks to raise the minimum aggregate achievement standard to five NCE gains. The Committee of Practitioners has generally discouraged moving to higher standards until local base line data has been established for attaining realistic goals for the Chapter 1 population.

Statewide Technical Assistance

The state education agency (SEA) offers technical assistance in the development of desired outcomes through workshops, assistance by telephone, correspondence and on-site help. The SEA disseminates student achievement studies, data from model programs, and other documents.

Once schools are identified for program improvement, the SEA provides a full range of services including on-site technical assistance, program development training workshops, monitoring of plan implementation, technical assistance center (TAC) services, staff exchange visits and distribution of written materials to assist LEAs. The SEA also has sponsored training workshops featuring model programs that focus on advanced skills. Many of these programs were identified through the National Diffusion Network (NDN). The SEA has also included advanced skills models at the annual statewide conferences.

The SEA has stressed program improvement as a positive process whereby instructional programs can become better to serve disadvantaged students and help them make greater academic gains. This emphasis has been fostered in all of the workshops and meetings with LEA Chapter 1 staff. Despite these efforts, many LEA staff view program improvement as an additional work burden. Further, local school boards do not appreciate their schools singled out as below standard.

The most common improvement the state staff have seen is better coordination between the regular program and Chapter 1. School staff members, with administrative support, are working closer by sharing their instructional plans for each Chapter 1 student.

Exiting Program Improvement

Two schools tested out of program improvement based on the 1989-90 testing cycle. Both schools tested out because of a program improvement plan and not because of test aberration. The SEA encourages schools to continue the program improvement process after exiting through participation in the state's school improvement program.

Joint SEA/LEA Plans

To date, funds requested to implement joint plans have been provided to LEAs with qualifying schools, but at this point there are few schools in the joint planning phase. The results of joint plans are not yet known.

Funding for Program Improvement

One part-time SEA consultant and one contractor are working with LEAs in developing joint plans and in monitoring implementation of all plans. The SEA supports these efforts with Chapter 1 state administrative funds and with program improvement funds. The SEA targets program improvement funds to schools based upon the needs as identified in the school program improvement plan.

Approximately 70 percent of program improvement money flows to LEAs. All state Chapter 1 staff are involved in program improvement, but it is difficult to estimate the amount of staff time devoted to this effort. Approximately 50 percent of state technical assistance in program improvement is supported by Chapter 1 administrative funds. Increased attention to program improvement has resulted in less frequent monitoring of Chapter 1 programs, less time devoted to studying overall evaluation results, less time for general assistance to LEA Chapter 1 staff and the complete elimination of program quality reviews of Chapter 1 programs.

Increasing Capacity for School Improvement

The State of Nevada would benefit from additional staff to increase SEA program improvement capacity and technical assistance in the establishment of outcome goals, testing, statewide performance, data management, and joint LEA/SEA projects.

In-service training through the annual state conference has focused on successful program models that reach disadvantaged children.

Additional Chapter 1 Innovation and Reform

Schoolwide Projects

Although four schools were eligible for schoolwide projects in the 1990-91 school year, none chose to undertake them. The SEA makes the following estimates of the number of schools that would be eligible for schoolwide projects if the low-income eligibility threshold were lowered from 75 percent to the following levels: 12 schools at 60 percent, 17 schools at 50 percent, and 31 schools at 40 percent.

Coordination with the Regular Classroom

The SEA encourages LEAs to provide Chapter 1 services using either an in-class or a pull-out model for instruction. Coordination is easily achieved in the in-class model as instruction is generally under the overall direction of the regular classroom teacher. Coordination is encouraged in pull-out instruction through addressing this item in the application approval process, and again during the on-site review activity. Also, workshops at the Chapter 1 state conferences of recent years have addressed this topic.

In-service training through the annual state conference has focused on successful program models that reach disadvantaged children and other culturally diverse students who are likely Chapter 1 students. The state school improvement program also addresses instruction for all students, particularly those who are under-achieving.

There are no particular or specific efforts in teacher preparation institutions that address Chapter 1 students. Courses are available, however, on addressing individual differences, educational diagnosis and remediation, cultural diversity, and the selection of instructional materials.

Statewide Coordination

Nevada's school improvement program is based on the thirteen attributes of school success. Participation is voluntary, which creates local support for improvement and excellence. Where possible, this effort has been coordinated with Chapter 1 program improvement.

The SEA's experience with federal staff monitoring at times conflicts with encouragement for flexibility offered by other U.S. Department of Education officials.

The Chapter 1 (early childhood) consultant and the Northern Nevada Head Start director both serve on the Far West Lab Board of Directors for early childhood education coordination of five western states. This coordination has provided opportunities to assess services provided to disadvantaged students. The SEA has, through cooperative efforts with the National Diffusion Network, trained Chapter 1 staff in validated early childhood programs for implementation in eligible schools. At least three school districts in the state have implemented pre-K through grade 3 early childhood developmental programs.

Special education programs provide funds to develop student proficiency so that children can be mainstreamed in the regular classroom and receive Chapter 1 instruction if necessary. The SEA also recommends to LEAs that they follow the criteria stated in the Chapter 1 Policy Manual for special education children with mild disabilities.

English-as-a-second language (ESL) education programs provide funds to develop student English language skills required to be successful. Once language skills have been attained, eligible students receive supplemental instruction in Chapter 1. The SEA recommends to LEAs that they follow the criteria stated in the Chapter 1 Policy Manual for providing Chapter 1 services to limited-English-proficient children. The state Second Language Consultant and Chapter 1 staff work closely together to recommend the most appropriate placement for students eligible for both types of services.

Making a Difference School by School

Program Improvement at Walter Bracken Elementary School, Las Vegas

Walter Bracken Elementary was one of nine schools in the Clark County School District involved in Chapter 1 program improvement during the 1991-92 school year. In the spring of 1991, a committee was formed consisting of the principal, the Chapter 1 teacher, a third grade teacher, a parent, and two Chapter 1 administrators. A survey was administered to all the teachers at the school to determine which of the thirteen effective school indicators needed to be addressed in the development of the School Success Action Plan. Areas identified were coordination between the regular school and Chapter 1 programs, parent/community involvement, and professional development and training. In addition, the school has implemented an alternative pull-out program in which the students leave their regular classroom to attend Chapter 1 reading for two hours and twenty minutes, four days a week.

To improve the coordination between the regular and Chapter 1 programs, an articulation form was developed. The Chapter 1 teacher and the regular classroom teachers document coordination activities on this form and delineate students' strengths and weaknesses.

To strengthen parent and community involvement, one day per week is set aside as a parent involvement day. On this day, students do not receive Chapter 1 instruction. Instead, the teacher and the teacher aide work with parents through parent education workshops, informal meetings, parent conferences, home visitations, and telephone contacts. It is anticipated that the parent involvement day will allow every parent of the seventy-five Chapter 1 youngsters to be contacted at least once.

To increase professional development and training and to improve the cooperation between the regular and Chapter 1 classrooms, schoolwide staff development activities are conducted in the areas of reading and whole language. Staff members also are provided the opportunity to participate in district-wide professional growth activities. District and Chapter 1 funds were used to purchase reading, whole language, and supplemental materials for these activities.

In January 1992, a mid-year review was conducted. It was determined that the school was on target in meeting the School Success Action Plan's goal of improving the basic and advanced reading skills of Chapter 1 students.

New Hampshire

Chapter 1 Participation and Funding Summary

Participation Levels in School Year (SY) 1990-91

Number of Children Served:	13,149
Percentage of K-12 Children Served:	7%
Number and Percentage of School Districts Receiving Chapter 1 Assistance:	175; 99%
Number and Percentage of Schools Receiving Chapter 1 Assistance:	305; 67%

Chapter 1 Services by Grade Span in SY 1990-91

Preschool	1%
Kindergarten	3%
Grades 1-3	55%
Grades 4-6	25%
Grades 7-12	16%

State Funding Levels by School Year

Formula Grants Allocation SY 1990-91, 1991-92:	$11,505,334; $12,937,372
Formula Grants Allocation SY 1992-93:	$14,845,248
Chapter 1 Per Pupil Expenditure SY 1990-91:	$875
Program Improvement Allocation SY 1991-92, 1992-93:	$90,000; $180,000

Chapter 1 Program Improvement Summary

Number of Schools in Program Improvement in SY 1991-92

Total Number of Schools in Program Improvement:	64
Percentage of Chapter 1 Schools in Program Improvement:	21%
Number of Schools in Joint Planning:	1

Statewide Minimum Standards for Improvement –A normal curve equivalent (NCE) gain greater than zero.

Chapter 1 Program Improvement

Leveraging Accountability and Higher Performance

Program improvement is viewed as a positive opportunity for Chapter 1 programs and schools. The program improvement effort, for all its pitfalls, is worthwhile.

In some schools, Chapter 1 is serving as the major impetus for school improvement. Training for local school improvement efforts stresses that integration with the regular school program is an essential part of Chapter 1 school improvement.

The state education agency (SEA) encourages schools to establish effective locally determined desired outcomes through the inclusion of questions about other desired outcomes in the application form.

Statewide Technical Assistance

The SEA is planning a series of networking meetings to provide technical assistance to the forty schools identified for program improvement with FY 91 data. Six of these schools will also participate in a more intense pilot program that will focus on integrated components of school development such as team building, organizing for improvement, establishing a direction, developing action plans, preparing for change, and implementing action plans. On-site assistance will be provided either by SEA staff or independent consultants to all schools requesting it.

Most districts were evaluating advanced skills in reading before the Hawkins-Stafford requirements. Math assessments in advanced skills have been influenced by the requirements. Program improvement efforts have not been primarily based on particular models.

Coordination with the Regular Classroom

The SEA does not expressly prefer that local education agencies (LEAs) provide services in either an in-class or pull-out model. Coordination information is requested as part of the application process. The Chapter 1 Sharing Conference, which is held every two years, acts as the SEA's major effort inservice training.

Exiting Program Improvement

Twenty-two out of twenty-five schools identified for program improvement during SY 1989-90 tested out of the program. The State Department of Education attributes this high number to both an aberration in test scores and to program improvement. For schools that tested out of program improvement, the SEA still reviews program improvement

plans. The SEA encourages implementation of plans whether or not schools tested out.

Joint SEA/LEA Plans

The SEA has identified one school for a joint plan. SEA staff members have been involved directly with the building team (teachers, administrators, and parents) and individual activities have responded to their specific needs.

Funding for Program Improvement

All of the state's FY91 program improvement money has been distributed to date in the form of mini-grants to LEAs.

State technical assistance in program improvement is supported completely by state administrative funds. Approximately 6 percent of Chapter 1 staff time is devoted to program improvement activities. The SEA has been faced with ever-increasing demands imposed by program improvement requirements. Helping districts arrive at more appropriate outcomes for Chapter 1 projects and ways to evaluate them is becoming a significant issue. Selecting, using, and evaluating test results is suddenly more than an exercise in filling out blanks. Report review at the SEA level is taking much more time than in the past. Developing strategies for effective program improvement planning, disseminating them to the LEAs, and providing support is very time-consuming. Time to fulfill these functions is coming directly from the monitoring efforts that have been the SEA's primary strategy for proactive program improvement in the past.

Increasing Capacity for School Improvement

To effectively meet the demands of program improvement, the SEA needs to add technical expertise and staff capacity to assist LEAs. Both process assistance and pedagogical expertise is critical. Program improvement money needs to be made more available for the SEAs to develop appropriate resources. Small, individual contracts at the LEA level are costing unrealistic amounts in terms of local personnel costs for research and management.

If the SEA had an additional $200,000 available for program improvement purposes at the SEA level, the SEA would add 1.5 full time equivalent (FTE) process consultants to assist LEAs at the building level with specific instructional improvement strategies. The remaining funds would support training for LEA staff in the areas of program improvement and fund a half-time clerical position to keep track of program improvement records and activities.

To effectively meet the demands of program improvement, the SEA needs to add technical expertise and staff capacity to assist LEAs.

Additional Chapter 1 Innovation and Reform

Statewide Coordination

Recent reorganization of the New Hampshire School Improvement Project (SIP) has delayed coordination between Chapter 1 program improvement and the SIP. As soon as the situation is stabilized at the SIP office, the SEA will proceed with this effort.

Chapter 1 forms and processes are designed for the smaller districts. Added forms and processes, as required, are provided for the larger districts. The state provides the LEAs with data pertinent to maintenance of effort and target areas.

The SEA has sponsored meetings for providers of preschool services in the northern counties to ensure maximum penetration. The SEA has always made it clear that Chapter 1 funds may be used for preschool services.

Since the early 1980s, the SEA has continuously explained that special education and limited-English-proficient (LEP) students are eligible for Chapter 1 services even though Chapter 1 may not provide services otherwise required by law or court decision. Chapter 1 funds may not be used to provide services that should be included in a student's Individualized Education Plan (IEP) or to meet the requirements of the law.

The criteria for selecting LEP students are the same as for any other student with an added requirement that the LEA establish that the lack of performance in the area served by Chapter 1 is not solely a language problem.

Joint meetings with special education and Chapter 1 directors have attempted to better clarify services Chapter 1 can provide. The determination of handicapping condition and appropriate IEP is a special education function. Chapter 1 may provide those services that should not be part of the IEP.

Making a Difference School by School

Program Improvement at Antrim Elementary School

The Antrim Elementary School responded to its need for a program improvement plan with a four-pronged attack. Initial progress was made because the district accepted the problem as a schoolwide issue and not solely a Chapter 1 concern. Their plan included the following steps:

- Because most of the Chapter 1 students not making gains were in the 3rd grade, the district's language arts consultant rescheduled her time to spend more time with the 3rd grade teachers in the regular classrooms.

• Most of the students who had not made gains were enrolled in a five-day-per-week before-school program staffed jointly by the district language arts consultant and the Chapter 1 project manager. Students who could not attend the before-school sessions were rescheduled for small-group instruction. These students, who had made no gains previously, made a full year's gain with this modification.

• Chapter 1 program improvement funds were used to provide a consultant to help teachers learn how to work more constructively with parents and to train parents in the Mega Skills program.

• Chapter 1 program improvement funds also provided books and staff for a summer reading program for Chapter 1 students. Each child participated in two one-hour sessions with the Chapter 1 project manager to discuss books read and select new materials.

New Jersey

Chapter 1 Participation and Funding Summary

Participation Levels in School Year (SY) 1990-91

Number of Children Served:	174,868
Percentage of K-12 Children Served:	14%
Number and Percentage of School Districts Receiving Chapter 1 Assistance:	592; 99%
Number and Percentage of Schools Receiving Chapter 1 Assistance:	2,038; 93%

Chapter 1 Services by Grade Span in SY 1990-91

Preschool	2%
Kindergarten	10%
Grades 1-3	34%
Grades 4-6	26%
Grades 7-12	28%

State Funding Levels by School Year

Formula Grants Allocation SY 1990-91, 1991-92:	$156,949,117; $183,322,803
Formula Grants Allocation SY 1992-93:	$200,366,534
Chapter 1 Per Pupil Expenditure SY 1990-91:	$898
Program Improvement Allocation SY 1991-92; 1992-93:	$446,286; $739,221

Chapter 1 Program Improvement Summary

Number of Schools in Program Improvement in SY 1991-92

Total Number of Schools in Program Improvement:	206
Percentage of Chapter 1 Schools in Program Improvement:	10%
Number of Schools in Joint Planning:	8

Statewide Minimum Standards for Improvement–A normal curve equivalent (NCE) gain greater than zero in basic and advanced skills and substantial progress toward meeting stated objectives in the school district application.

Chapter 1 Program Improvement

Leveraging Accountability and Higher Performance

Program improvement is an essential component of Chapter 1 because it addresses what Chapter 1 is all about. Just as the object of teaching a child is to enable him or her to get along without a teacher, so is the object of Chapter 1 to provide students with the opportunity to catch up with their agemates, achieve in the regular classroom and succeed without Chapter 1 support. The program improvement requirement is a way of looking at whether this is happening in a way that can be sustained. The joint planning aspect of this requirement is one of its strongest features, as it holds schools and state agencies accountable for working together to ensure that students do better than they would have done without the intervention of Chapter 1.

For the past six years the state education agency (SEA) has encouraged and expected schools to be in a continuous cycle of program improvement. This philosophy underlies the New Jersey Basis Skills Program Improvement Process (BSPIP).

Statewide Technical Assistance

The SEA encourages and helps schools establish effective locally determined desired outcomes through technical assistance, training, published guidelines, on-site visits and use of the technical assistance center (TAC).

Once schools are identified for improvement, the SEA offers technical assistance through a Chapter 1 Training Institute (COTI). For 1991-92, forty-five different workshops have been made available. Most of these workshops are offered in all three regions of the state. This training is provided by TAC and SEA staff. SEA staff consultants are available by telephone and in person to respond to the diverse technical assistance needs of districts. These needs include assistance in filling out applications, developing and evaluating programs, selecting materials and activities, analyzing alternate instructional settings, designing staff training and creating parent involvement activities. Schools that are still lagging in the third year are required to enter joint planning. The SEA also offers technical assistance through on-site visits, as well as through written and phone contact. Networking is also facilitated among districts to promote joint problem-solving activities.

All of the COTI workshops that focus on curriculum and instruction emphasize the development of advanced skills. The SEA includes in its workshops presentations by local education agencies (LEAs) that have programs worthy of emulation.

The SEA has integrated program improvement into the monitoring and the compliance process. Particular attention is given to program improvement schools. Staff are assigned to visit these

schools on a regular basis and to provide support in the achievement of program improvement goals.

The SEA has not had a problem with negative responses to program improvement at the local level. Schools first identified for program improvement seem confident that they can rise out of this status before they are required to implement joint plans. The SEA has just begun the joint planning process with the few schools that require it and does not anticipate a negative association with it. The schools seem particularly eager for any help they can get.

Successful Models

Program improvement schools, like many other schools in the state, are adopting whole language, cooperative learning (especially in mathematics), pre-kindergarten, all-day kindergarten and critical thinking programs. These approaches appear to be the most popular program improvement strategies.

districts recorded, it can be said that the districts in question did review and take seriously the program improvement process.

Joint SEA/LEA Plans

The New Jersey BSPIP process is used in joint planning. Three- to five-member teams from identified schools are trained to review each other's programs and make specific recommendations for program improvement, based on thirteen factors related to program effectiveness. The SEA provides the training, materials, and where feasible, on-site coaching when the program review is conducted. These activities are supported with state administrative funds. The SEA is considering targeting additional program improvement funds to schools with joint plans, where need can be established.

The unique attribute of all New Jersey's joint plans is that all schools entering the joint planning process will

A need exists for a one-time expenditure of monies to upgrade and expand information systems between LEAs and the SEA... the result would be greater efficiency of operation, plus better linkages and coordination with other SEA and LEA programs...

New Jersey's LEAs also lean heavily toward validated programs, such as Higher Order Thinking Skills (HOTS), Reading Recovery, and Project Write.

Exiting Program Improvement

A total of 181, or 84 percent of all the schools identified for Chapter 1 program improvement, tested out of program improvement before formal implementation. This phenomenon was probably produced by a combination of test score aberrations and partial implementation of program improvement plans. While it is not possible to estimate the extent to which each of these two factors influenced the gains that these

have had the benefit of training with a well-tested model. BSPIP has been used for the past five years in the state as a voluntary training tool for districts wishing to enlist their programs, school by school, in a continuous cycle of self-improvement. Now that BSPIP has been incorporated into the Chapter 1 State Program Improvement Plan as a major SEA-LEA planning tool, the SEA is providing the training primarily for lagging schools. In contrast to those schools which are conducting BSPIP reviews voluntarily and with limited technical assistance, the joint planning schools will have technical assistance throughout the process.

If implementation proceeds appropriately, the SEA anticipates more effective schools with more total staff and

administrative and parental support as the context within which Chapter 1 programs operate. The underlying concept of BSPIP is that the whole school shares the responsibility for the success of the supplemental program. The SEA expects that schools will emerge from joint planning with reduced isolation of Chapter 1 programs. Because all the factors built into the BSPIP re-design have been associated with consistently high year-end achievement gains, the SEA should be able to achieve more effective programs after BSPIP recommendations have been implemented for the length of a program improvement cycle.

Funding for Program Improvement

Presently $246,240 out of $369,360 (67%)of the 1990-91 program improvement funds have been distributed. These monies are being made available to LEAs through a request for proposal process. The SEA has made efforts to limit the proposal writing requirements of the program improvement grants to only the most essential descriptive material and documentation. Nonetheless, the amount of work still required to prepare a proposal and to obtain appropriate reviews and approvals within districts, coupled with the relatively small sums of funding available (approximately $1,700 per program improvement school), have discouraged some LEAs from submitting proposals. All of the program improvement monies are being used for mini-grants.

Approximately 25 percent of Chapter 1 administrative staff time is devoted to responsibilities associated with program improvement. Although no state administrative funds are set aside specifically for technical assistance for improvement, it is considered to be part of the responsibilities of staff to provide technical assistance in this area.

At this point, the SEA is managing to devote increased attention to program improvement without reducing Chapter 1 administrative activities. Information management activities have been stream-

lined and partially computerized, resulting in a savings of staff time. Through reorganization and reassignment of staff, the SEA has, within current funding limitations, also made more staff time available to assist in handling program improvement requirements. However, to meet current and expanding performance improvement and joint planning demands more fully with available resources, while maintaining all other operations at existing levels, the SEA can expect to face a difficult challenge.

Increasing Capacity for School Improvement

The SEA needs to plan additional on-site technical assistance for program improvement schools. Increased funds would allow the hiring of staff (full-time and temporary), as well as the solicitation of outside expertise and use of other additional personnel and resources to support program improvement activities. Additionally, a need exists for a one-time expenditure of monies to upgrade and expand information systems between LEAs and the SEA, as well as within the SEA, to more effectively manage communication, data collection and data analysis. The result would be greater efficiency of operation, plus better linkages and coordination with other SEA and LEA programs affecting schools that engage in program improvement and other Chapter 1 activities.

Additional Chapter 1 Innovation and Reform

Schoolwide Projects

Number of schoolwide projects in New Jersey by school year:

1989-90: 4
1990-91: 8
1991-92: 16

Sixty-six schools were eligible for schoolwide projects in 1990-91.

To encourage the development and implementation of schoolwide projects in the state, SEA staff have consulted with the TAC, attended national meetings on schoolwide projects, and visited demonstration projects in other states. The SEA has disseminated the information it has collected, including latest findings and models, to LEAs, and it has held meetings on this topic with LEA personnel. With SEA encouragement, LEAs have attended state and national workshops on schoolwide projects. The SEA has also brought together LEAs and the TAC to facilitate LEA initiatives in this area. By providing opportunities for LEAs to learn about schoolwide projects, the SEA has been encouraging the creation of such projects in those districts that qualify for them. Technical assistance has covered topics including the organization, implementation, delivery of instruction and evaluation of schoolwide projects.

Characteristics of current schoolwide projects in the state include the following: collaborative planning among staff at various levels, administration, and parents; reduction of class size; increased individualized instruction; interdisciplinary instruction; expansion of counseling opportunities; extension of school days; and parent programming.

The following number of schools would be eligible for schoolwide projects if the low-income eligibility threshold were lowered from 75 percent to the following levels: 128 schools at 60 percent, 176 schools at 50 percent, and 235 schools at 40 percent.

Coordination with the Regular Classroom

The SEA's BSPIP training emphasizes coordination with programming in regular classrooms, as do most COTI workshops. The SEA has also produced and distributed a training manual on the in-class model.

COTI stresses approaches designed to eliminate the need for remediation. The SEA does not view Chapter 1 students as a special category. Chapter 1 children are in the regular classroom because they belong there; Chapter 1 is conceptualized as a temporary supplement.

Statewide Coordination

To ensure delivery of a coordinated program improvement approach, New Jersey's BSPIP reviewers view the program in the context of the school, the district, and the community.

Coordination between programs has been a high-priority concern in the reorganization of the SEA. The newly-created Urban Division of the New Jersey Department of Education is intended to be a school-based improvement program for the state's thirty special needs districts. New Jersey also operates a City Schools of Excellence grant program based on an Effective Schools model.

The SEA is making efforts to coordinate Chapter 1 and Chapter 2 programs. Chapter 2 funds subsidize the purchase of audio-visual and other instructional materials that are used in the Chapter 1 program improvement schools. The SEA is in continuous contact with its Chapter 1 counterparts in other states on coordination issues. Programs in neighboring states have been visited as well.

A few years ago the SEA convened a Paperwork Reduction Task Force, which interviewed superintendents across the state. This effort resulted in some streamlining of paperwork requirements. Consistent with this concern, the state's application for Chapter 1 funds has been shortened considerably. Presently, for all paperwork that the SEA requires from LEAs, prior approval must be granted by the LEA Data Collection and Analysis Review Committee, a group comprised of individuals representing LEAs in the state.

In the area of early childhood education, Chapter 1 Even Start is coordinated with Head Start programs. The state is allocating $7 million dollars to Good Start, a pre-kindergarten program that is also coordinated with both Head Start and Chapter 1 preschool programs. Through technical assistance, the SEA encourages the use of Chapter 1 funds for preschool programs.

Within the guidlines that the SEA prepares and disseminates to LEAs, there is material on the ways in which

Chapter 1 programs are to be coordinated with special education and bilingual programs, as well as with state funds for at-risk students (which have replaced state compensatory education monies). This material includes, but is not limited to, information describing procedures through which students are to be selected for Chapter 1 services and the means through with such services are to be delivered, so that they supplement the students' other educational programming.

Making a Difference School by School

Schoolwide project at Monument School, Trenton

The Monument School in Trenton serves children in grades K-6, and is in the second year of implementing its Chapter 1 schoolwide project plan. The school administration, professional and support staff, and community representatives discussed and developed this plan during the 1989-90 school year and began implementation in 1990-91.

Since Trenton is one of New Jersey's thirty designated special needs urban districts, where the concentration of poverty is high and many children are at risk of school failure, an overriding goal was to reduce the child-to-adult ratio, thereby providing each youngster with more individual attention and creating a more positive learning climate. The school planning team also wished to increase parent involvement and effectiveness, and to increase the amount of time spent on relevant learning activities.

Major features of this improved learning environment are described below:

- A full-time paraprofessional has been assigned to each kindergarten and a half-time paraprofessional placed into each first and second grade class. A teacher trained in early childhood education provides individualized supplemental instruction to small groups of students from these classes.
- The child/teacher ratio in all classes in grades 3 through 6 have been reduced to no more than a thirteen to one ratio for readingz, writing and mathematics instruction. Individual teachers work with two groups of students each day for two hours and fifteen minutes. This arrangement also allows for interdisciplinary instruction.
- A full-time guidance counselor has been provided to permit early identification/intervention and to prevent the need for later remediation.
- Parent involvement and effectiveness have been fostered by parent training in areas such as homework assistance and parenting skills. A parental tutoring program for one-on-one tutoring of kindergarten through second grade students is now in place. An extended school day program also encourages parental participation.

District officials note that the Monument Schoolwide Project has served as a district model for those schools exploring possible implementation of schoolwide projects.

Program Improvement at Taunton Forge School, Medford

The basic skills mathematics instruction at Taunton Forge School, an elementary school in a semi-rural/suburban district with some retirement communities, is delivered by means of a pull-out program. Students in this program also receive regularly scheduled mathematics instruction in the classroom. Basic skills teachers meet with the regular classroom teachers as needed to discuss student progress in the class setting, revise the instructional objectives and facilitate the delivery of additional support services that would benefit the students. The program is supervised by a program coordinator and the school principal.

The instructional program was developed in accordance with the developmental guidelines and recommendations articulated in the Curriculum and Evaluation Standards for School Mathematics by the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics. Additionally, use was made of a cooperative learning model provided by the Association of Supervision and Curriculum Development. The program has been designed to do the following:

1. Introduce cooperative learning strategies to increase student participation and the probability for transfer of learning from basic skills assistance to the classroom setting.

Basic skills students actively participate within heterogeneously-organized cooperative math groups in the regular classroom. Students use manipulatives to examine how math problems can be analyzed, engage in peer coaching, and rehearse their responses with a peer group.

Student performance is assessed by means of informal and formal measures developed by individual classroom teachers, as well as through schoolwide instruments acquired by the district or developed by the program coordinator. Results are used to monitor student progress and identify ways of strengthening the instructional program.

2. Provide in-district staff development in mathematics instruction for the basic skills and classroom teachers who deliver mathematics instruction to basic skills students.

Monthly staff development sessions are provided by the district coordinator who received training in cooperative learning. Follow-up grade level meetings for the basic skills teacher and classroom teachers allow discussion of specific strategies and their effects on student learning. In regularly scheduled meetings with selected teachers, the school principal and the program coordinator, plans are developed for the implementation of cooperative learning strategies.

Classroom and school-level measures of student performance suggest that the program has had beneficial effects upon student learning. Aggregate basic mathematics NCE scores for students in the program showed a gain of 6.8 on the California Achievement Test in the spring of 1991 after two consecutive years of losses.

New Mexico

Chapter 1 Participation and Funding Summary

Participation Levels in School Year (SY) 1990-91

Number of Children Served:	39,032
Percentage of K-12 Children Served:	14%
Number and Percentage of School Districts Receiving Chapter 1 Assistance:	88; 100%
Number and Percentage of Schools Receiving Chapter 1 Assistance:	442; 70%

Chapter 1 Services by Grade Span in SY 1990-91

Preschool	1%
Kindergarten	7%
Grades 1-3	40%
Grades 4-6	28%
Grades 7-12	24%

State Funding Levels by School Year

Formula Grants Allocation SY 1990-91, 1991-92:	$37,054,810; $40,185,695
Formula Grants Allocation SY 1992-93:	$44,288,563
Chapter 1 Per Pupil Expenditure SY 1990-91:	$949
Program Improvement Allocation SY 1991-92; 1992-93:	$97,937; $180,000

Chapter 1 Program Improvement Summary

Number of Schools in Program Improvement in SY 1991-92

Total Number of Schools in Program Improvement:	116
Percentage of Chapter 1 Schools in Program Improvement:	26%
Number of Schools in Joint Planning:	8

Statewide Minimum Standards for Improvement–Greater than zero normal curve equivalent (NCE) gain and substantial progress in achieving other locally determined desired outcomes.

Chapter 1 Program Improvement

Leveraging Accountability and Higher Performance

The New Mexico State Department of Education supports program improvement in Chapter 1 because it allows state, local, and school staff to look at what is being done with Chapter 1 services and to rethink their expectations for disadvantaged children. In many cases in New Mexico, Chapter 1 program improvement has not just helped the Chapter 1 program, but has acted as a catalyst to look at the total school or total district program.

There are currently no plans to raise the minimum standard, since the Committee of Practitioners (COP) voted unanimously against a higher standard and stated in the strongest possible terms that school districts should have the option to set desired outcomes at a level that is most appropriate to their own programs and participants.

Statewide Technical Assistance

The SEA has encouraged LEAs to review all data and to set desired outcomes in areas such a retention rates, parent involvement, attendance, and drop-out reduction. In workshops, handouts, and other verbal and printed materials, the SEA provides training on other types of desired outcomes.

The SEA added an additional staff member to the Chapter 1 Unit, whose duties include the responsibility for the program improvement effort. This person provides technical assistance in the form of workshops, on-site meetings, and through other means, as requested by the school district. The program improvement specialist has provided materials in the area of advanced skills and successful models in her presentations and as requested by LEAs.

The SEA provides LEAs with appropriate responses to questions regarding identification for program improvement and the initiation of joint planning. Staff have taken the opportunity during monitoring to stress the positive aspects of the program improvement effort. Monitoring procedures have also incorporated questions that are designed to help ensure compliance with program improvement goals.

In some cases, identification for program improvement has shown that the regular program, not the Chapter 1 program, may be responsible. In such cases, coordination with the regular program is strengthened. In New Mexico, some districts are implementing "Re: Learning" strategies.

Exiting Program Improvement

There were twelve schools that were identified for program improvement in 1989-90 that tested out of program improvement before their plans were fully implemented. However, the SEA does encourage schools that develop plans to implement them regardless of the results of testing.

Joint SEA/LEA Plans

To date, the joint planning process has been done on a case-by-case basis. Having a person responsible for program improvement has enabled the SEA to customize joint planning procedures according to the needs of the districts involved. The schools identified for joint planning have at least equal access to the program improvement funds available. It is too early in the joint planning process to comment on the results.

Funding for Program Improvement

All of the 1990-91 program improvement funds have been distributed. Because of the deadline of March 31 for program improvement plans specified in the State Program Improvement Plan, it was difficult to distribute funds in a timely manner in 1990-91. Therefore, the SEA has specified that only those districts that submit plans by January 31 will be eligible for the funds. It is expected that this change will facilitate the expenditure of program improvement funds. All of the funds are being used at the LEA level.

Approximately 15 percent of the Chapter 1 unit's staff time is directly devoted to program improvement. About the same percentage of state administrative funds are spent in this area. There has been no reduction of other Chapter 1 administrative activities, since the SEA was able to hire an additional person with the increased administration funding.

Increasing Capacity for School Improvement

During the current school year, local Chapter 1 staff, along with LEA personnel, have been receiving training through workshops to build capacity in all areas of program improvement. Additional resources for these activities would increase the quantity and quality of the kinds of assistance now provided. Additional funds could be used for increased on-site assistance.

Additional Chapter 1 Innovation and Reform

Schoolwide Projects

The number of schoolwide projects in New Mexico by school year:

1989-90	9
1990-91	25
1991-92	39

Approximately 130 schools were eligible for schoolwide projects in 1990-91.

Districts that are eligible for schoolwide projects have been eager to take advantage of this option. The SEA has, at every opportunity, addressed the requirements in this area during workshops and has made information available on request. The SEA encourages anyone considering this option to visit school districts that are implementing schoolwide projects. Districts that plan to implement a schoolwide project receive extensive technical assistance in proposal preparation from their assigned staff specialist.

Schools implementing schoolwide projects have undergone various degrees of curriculum integration, especially with other federal programs. New Mexico does not impose additional criteria for approving schoolwide projects beyond what is required by regulation. Maintenance of effort requirements have not had an effect on eligibility for schoolwide projects. About 10 percent of the schoolwide projects however, may have problems meeting the performance improvement requirements because of the projects' failure to make significant gains in achievement and concentrate services on the most educationally deprived children.

The following numbers of schools would be eligible for schoolwide projects if the low-income eligibility threshold were lowered from 75 percent to the following levels: 257 schools at 60 percent, 350 schools at 50 percent, and 442 schools at 40 percent.

Coordination with the Regular Classroom

The SEA includes, in its monitoring procedures, a checklist for reviewing coordination with the regular classroom. The annual evaluation includes a requirement for reviewing progress in the regular program.

The Chapter 1 unit coordinates a regional in-service training effort, which involves all staff at Chapter 1 sites. These workshops include training in new approaches to working with educationally-deprived children and dissemination of extensive information on Chapter 1 requirements.

In many cases in New Mexico, Chapter 1 program improvement has not just helped the Chapter 1 program, but has acted as a catalyst to look at the total school or total district program.

Statewide Coordination

New Mexico's plan for addressing continued school improvement establishes a framework for coordinating school reforms and resources. Chapter 1 is involved in helping meet the overall objectives. When state-sponsored compensatory education programs are developed, Chapter 1 is always involved in the coordinating efforts. The state plan for Consolidating Initiative for Tomorrow's Education (CITE) incorporates procedures for cooperation in state and federal compensatory programs.

In order to ensure the minimum administrative and paperwork requirements at the local level, the SEA Chapter 1 unit imposes no further requirements beyond those mandated by law or regulations. The SEA makes an effort to develop forms and reports

that are minimally burdensome to the LEA.

There are always efforts to coordinate Chapter 1 with Head Start or other state and local preschool programs serving disadvantaged youth within districts that operate such programs. In addition, the state is currently in the process of forming a Department of Children and Youth, which will formally coordinate efforts at this level. Districts are not specifically encouraged to use Chapter 1 funds for early childhood programs; however, they are instructed on how to use the results of the required annual needs assessment to determine how Chapter 1 funding can be used to the best advantage.

Coordination of Chapter 1 services with special education and bilingual programs occurs in all districts through various means including screening committees, teacher referrals, and LEA planning efforts. The SEA has always encouraged such coordination and provides assistance whenever possible or as requested. The SEA relies solely on the regulations in selecting limited English proficient (LEP) and special education students for Chapter 1 services. On a number of occasions, special education and bilingual staff have met with Chapter 1 staff regarding responsibility for services to such children. There have not been major problems in this area.

Making a Difference School by School

Schoolwide Project at Santo Domingo School

The schoolwide project at Santo Domingo School is directly linked to a comprehensive restructuring of the school's educational program. Before the implementation of the schoolwide project three years ago, the many different federal programs available to this all-Indian school were offered in the form of pull-outs. Students were pulled out for Chapter 1, Title V tutoring, bilingual, and special education services. As a result, no one teacher took responsibility for the total educational program of the students. There was little coordination and students were pulled out of the regular classroom all day long.

The Chapter 1 schoolwide project changed this structure by eliminating all pull-out programs and replacing them with in-class program designs. The schoolwide program provided additional staff to lower the pupil/teacher ratio in grades where test scores and needs assessment indicated that students had the greatest needs. This has lead to a greater degree of individualized instruction and an increase in achievement. Besides increased reading achievement, other objectives of the program are to decrease absenteeism, improve self-esteem, increase parental involvement, and upgrade the skills and educational strategies of the teaching staff. Through incentive programs, positive reinforcement, and a greater degree of student success, attendance and self-esteem have improved.

Increasing parental involvement is an important part of the schoolwide project. Parenting classes help parents develop skills that will help them help their children. Staff development is also provided on a monthly basis.

Topics that have been addressed during in-services include teaching higher-order thinking skills, whole-language, re-learning, learning styles, and teaching styles. The Chapter 1 schoolwide project has been the vehicle through which the Santo Domingo School has restructured and reformed its educational program.

Program Improvement at Dolores Gonzales Elementary School, Albuquerque

Dolores Gonzales Elementary School implemented an improvement plan during the 1990-91 school year. The plan has had a positive impact on the performance of the Chapter 1 and non-Chapter 1 children. The areas of concentration have included closer coordination and collaboration between Chapter 1 and the regular school program, enhancement of parental involvement, staff development in the area of curriculum strategies, and instituting successful schoolwide curricula. The support staff and the regular school staff developed a closely-knit team to review improvement in student achievement, concentrating on the most educationally-deprived students.

The additional resources (program improvement and innovative funds) that were allocated both from the SEA and LEA levels had a positive impact on the ability of the school to follow through with its plan. An educational assistant was hired to enhance parental involvement and more substitutes are being used to allow teachers time for collaboration and the development of curriculum revisions.

New York

Chapter 1 Participation and Funding Summary

Participation Levels in School Year (SY) 1990-91

Number of Children Served:	383,183
Percentage of K-12 Children Served:	12%
Number and Percentage of School Districts Receiving Chapter 1 Assistance:	719; 100%
Number and Percentage of Schools Receiving Chapter 1 Assistance:	3,052; 49%

Chapter 1 Services by Grade Span in SY 1990-91

Preschool	1%
Kindergarten	7%
Grades 1-3	37%
Grades 4-6	29%
Grades 7-12	27%

State Funding Levels by School Year

Formula Grants Allocation SY 1990-91, 1991-92:	$516,825,606; $606,413,788
Formula Grants Allocation SY 1992-93:	$669,151,579
Chapter 1 Per Pupil Expenditure SY 1990-91:	$1,138
Program Improvement Allocation SY 1991-92; 1992-93:	$1,478,696; $2,467,056

Chapter 1 Program Improvement Summary

Number of Schools in Program Improvement in SY 1991-92

Total Number of Schools in Program Improvement:	302
Percentage of Chapter 1 Schools in Program Improvement:	10%
Number of Schools in Joint Planning:	6

Statewide Minimum Standards for Improvement: Desired outcomes for aggregate performance are established by each local education agency (LEA). The state education agency (SEA) recommends standards for aggregate performance higher than the statutory requirement.

Chapter 1 Program Improvement

Leveraging Accountability and Higher Performance

The New York State Education Department has consistently promoted school improvement throughout the last decade, culminating in a sweeping school reform initiative entitled *A New Compact for Learning*. Chapter 1, with its emphasis on locally established performance outcomes and provisions for cooperative planning in the development program improvement plans, is also enthusiastically supported by the New York State Board of Regents. Both the Compact and Chapter 1 stress mastery rather than competency, encourage broad collaboration (including parents, teachers, administrators, and other school and community members) in setting standards of excellence, and inspire a determination to make the process of education accountable for achieving results.

The Board of Regents now expects schools to establish ambitious standards of excellence consistent with the goals and strategic objectives established for the state. To assist schools in developing respectable performance standards, the SEA makes statewide achievement data available to all LEAs, which allows them to establish desired outcomes consistent with performance standards across the state.

Similarly, the state's Chapter 1 Committee of Practitioners (COP) encourages LEAs to set standards above the statutory requirement for aggregate achievement gains and to set other desired outcomes for children served by each school's Chapter 1 program. Further, while the COP encourages LEAs to raise the minimum standard, it also would like to see greater emphasis on performance assessment. Clearly, Chapter 1 program improvement has changed the way schools design and deliver educational services by maintaining a focus on student performance and accountability for learning and instilling a commitment to success in the core classroom.

Statewide Technical Assistance

Technical assistance is currently provided by the SEA to schools identified for program improvement through printed materials, workshops, on-site visits, and collaboration with the Regional Technical Assistance Center (RTAC). Upon completion of each on-site visit, staff members prepare a written report, which analyzes the school's activities and recommends program improvement strategies. The SEA has tried to reduce any negative association at the local level stemming from identification of schools for program improvement or initiation of joint plans by directing staff to take a very positive, supportive approach when dealing with the LEAs about these issues, providing workshops in each region of

the state, and assisting the LEAs in the submission of plans and grants. A yearly statewide Chapter 1 program improvement forum provides schools with an opportunity to network and hear presenters on various aspects of school reform, technology, and curriculum.

Joint SEA/LEA Plans

Once a school is identified to be in need of a joint SEA/LEA program improvement plan, all district and school personnel are notified of the process, as is the SEA program manager, who assists in creating a timeline for joint plan development. An on-site visit is arranged at which time members of the school's Chapter 1 program improvement planning team and the SEA discuss the basis for reidentification and analyze pertinent information, such as aggregate performance and the number of Chapter 1 staff who will be available in the building over the three-year period.

After assessing the instructional program and establishing desired outcomes, an implementation timeline is developed. One team member is responsible for each activity. The SEA program manager is available throughout the planning process as an integral member of the planning team. Contact between the SEA and the LEA is also maintained throughout the implementation of the joint plan. To assist the LEA in implementation, a $5,000 Chapter 1 program improvement grant is made available to each school from the SEA.

Attributes of the SEA/LEA plans focus on restructuring programs, professional staff development, parent partnerships, congruence, student assessment, and the monitoring of student progress. The actual performance data of the SEA/LEA joint plan efforts are not yet available. To date, LEAs and the SEA have described their experiences with joint plans as a positive, meaningful way to share resources and create better programs.

Funding for Program Improvement

As of January 1991, the SEA had distributed about 75 percent of the 1990-91 Chapter 1 program improvement funds; approximately 60 percent of which is being used for mini-grants to LEAs. About 30 percent of Chapter 1 administrative staff time is devoted to program improvement and is supported by approximately 25 percent of state administrative funds. With increased attention devoted to program improvement, yearly on-site comprehensive program reviews have been reduced to different degrees depending on the size of the district program. Each district that is not part of a review conducts an annual self-assessment of its programs and submits the results to the SEA, at which time a district can request on-site technical assistance.

Increasing Capacity for School Improvement

Given significant additional funds, the SEA would probably develop Chapter 1 Program Improvement Training Centers to serve all districts receiving Chapter 1 funds. These centers would be staffed with people who could devote all their time and resources to schools requiring direct assistance in improving their Chapter 1 programs. The centers would also focus on strengthening parent participation, establishing outcomes, designing appropriate and coordinated instruction, and selecting appropriate performance measures. Program improvement specialists would be fully trained in staff development including programs and services for non-public schools. Funds would also strengthen the state's ability to provide more refined evaluation and data analysis strategies, including increased assistance to LEAs in the timely and appropriate use of evaluation results. All program improvement would be approached in concert with *America 2000* goals and objectives, along with *A New Compact for Learning*, the New York State program for school reform.

Additional Chapter 1 Innovation and School Reform

Schoolwide Projects

Number of schoolwide projects in New York by school year:

1989-90:	7
1990-91:	51
1991-92:	121

In September 1989, seven New York City schools submitted schoolwide project plans as part of their Consolidated Applications. These were the first applications for Chapter 1 schoolwide projects in the state. During the 1989-90 school year, eighty-three schools were eligible to plan schoolwide projects.

In October 1990, the New York City public schools provided a second opportunity for schools to develop schoolwide projects to meet their identified areas of need. During the current school year, 311 new schools were eligible to participate in planning schoolwide projects for implementation in September 1991. More than ninety schools accepted this invitation and sixty-eight schools submitted approved plans. Two approved plans were submitted by the City of Rochester.

In the thirty-two school districts in New York City, 346 schools (43 percent) qualify for schoolwide projects under the current 75 percent low-income requirement. In addition, a sampling of forty-five upstate districts (including Syracuse, Rochester, Buffalo, and Yonkers) and the next eight largest city school districts in upstate New York, shows that at least fifty presently qualify for schoolwide projects under the same requirement. The New York State Department of Education estimates that 31 percent of schools currently eligible have undertaken schoolwide projects.

The New York State Department of Education strongly supports the schoolwide project initiative because it represents an opportunity to plan for to-

tal school improvement and redesign of the entire educational program in an eligible school through school-based management and shared decision making. Various curricular, instructional, and organizational changes have been undertaken through the schoolwide project initiatives. Instructional strategies commonly found at schoolwide project sites include a literature-based, whole-language approach to reading instruction; cooperative learning; co-teaching and team teaching; thematic, interdisciplinary, and multi-cultural approaches; peer tutoring; learning centers; extended-day enrichment activities; and clubs supporting classroom activities.

The SEA consults with all districts concerning the financial and programmatic requirements of schoolwide projects during yearly Consolidated Application workshops. This application contains questions that must be addressed by each school in the district planning to implement a schoolwide project. Districts and schools that qualify for schoolwide projects are provided with technical assistance through on-site visits by SEA staff, as well as workshops provided by the Chapter 1 TAC.

The SEA has made schools aware of the performance requirements for schoolwide projects and has advised schools to establish benchmarks during each school year. To ensure that districts were fully aware of these special performance requirements, workshops devoted exclusively to schoolwide projects implementation were conducted prior to and at the beginning of the 1991-92 school year.

When the SEA combines the New York City figures and upstate data sampling, which represent approximately 75 percent of the Chapter 1 funds allocated to school districts in New York State, the following projections can be made for the number of schools in the state that would be eligible for schoolwide projects if the low-income eligibility requirements were reduced from 75 percent to the following levels: 625 schools at 60 percent, 731 schools at 50 percent, and 840 schools at 40 percent.

Coordination with the Regular Classroom

The SEA has advocated establishing Chapter 1 programs as instructional support services intended to increase success in the regular classroom program. The New York State Board of Regents has passed a policy on congruence, which affirms its position on properly integrating compensatory education services with the regular course of instruction and specifies the need to coordinate curriculum and strengthen communication between Chapter 1 and regular classroom teachers.

The SEA's emphasis on congruence and success in the regular classroom program focuses attention on higher-order thinking skills. Advanced skills are also an important focus of the annual Chapter 1 program improvement forum. The SEA has encouraged schools and school districts to use approaches other than the traditional pull-out model. It has developed a booklet describing a wide range of strategies for organizing instructional support services, including the advantages and disadvantages of each model. Various workshops have been conducted around the state to discuss these strategies.

Program improvement and success in the regular classroom have become the focal points for Chapter 1 monitoring, compliance, and technical assistance. New York State has refocused monitoring activities on desired outcomes stated in the grant application and the Annual Review of Effectiveness. During site visits, the Annual Review is discussed with the LEA to reinforce the connection between the desired outcomes, the Annual Review, and program improvement. This year, state compensatory education programs have also been brought into line with Chapter 1 program improvement by means of the addition of an annual review requirement. The SEA's Consolidated Application requires districts to integrate planning for programs from various funding streams so that overall district needs are addressed through the best possible use of available resources.

To date, LEAs and the SEA have described their experiences with joint plans as a positive, meaningful way to share resources and create better programs.

Statewide Coordination

Chapter 1 desired outcomes, program improvement, parental involvement, and success in the regular classroom program are all in line with *A New Compact for Learning*. Chapter 1 provides added impetus to many aspects of this program, particularly mastery and program accountability.

New York State addresses school improvement through several channels. The assistant commissioner for quality assurance is responsible for what is currently known as the Excellence and Accountability Program (EAP), which is a planning approach to school improvement that emphasizes standards of excellence tied into a registration review process. All schools must meet the requirements of school registration. Schools that do not must undertake school improvement initiatives. Chapter 1 program improvement plans are closely coordinated with these activities and schoolwide projects are developed whenever possible. All improvement efforts are coordinated to allow for a consistent and effective action plan.

In addition to Chapter 1, the Pupils with Special Education Needs (PSEN) program targets services to disadvantaged students. The same staff members involved in Chapter 1 are also involved in PSEN. Goals and monitoring requirements are similar and coordinated, and a consolidated application is required.

Chapter 2 funds in the state have been deliberately funneled toward staff development that enhances existing Chapter 1 programs. The Chapter 2 application is part of the Consolidated Application, which also includes Chapter 1 and the state compensatory education programs.

In coordination with early childhood education, Chapter 1 funds are beginning to address compensatory needs more aggressively in the early grades. As Even Start gains more momentum, greater attention to the early use of all Chapter 1 funds will be encouraged. The SEA has consistently stressed pre-k and early intervention as high priorities.

In order to coordinate the various categorical programs better, the state is streamlining application requirements for several categorical programs, which together total less than $75,000 in grant funds. It was decided that collapsing previously individual grants into a single packet would encourage schools to use the funds most effectively.

In order to coordinate bilingual education with Chapter 1, the state Chapter 1 office and the bilingual office currently have a work group developing a policy statement for compensatory services to limited English proficient (LEP) students.

There is also a state policy for serving children with disabilities who are also eligible for Chapter 1. The policy was developed in consultation with SEA staff responsible for special education. It clarifies eligibility requirements and explains how the appropriate instructional services are to be provided and how Chapter 1 evaluation requirements must be applied for this unique group of students. The policy is being distributed to the field and training activities will be planned jointly by the special education and the Chapter 1 offices in the SEA.

Making a Difference School by School

Schoolwide Project at P.S. 67, Brooklyn

As a result of the schoolwide project, P.S. 67, the first African-American school in Brooklyn, has undertaken a number of initiatives to better serve the needs of the total student population. Listed below are just a few of the numerous initiatives noted during an on-site visit by the SEA program manager:

- Administrators, teachers, and other instructional and non-instructional staff exhibit enthusiasm and support for the wide variety of programs implemented at this site. The schoolwide project stresses coming together, sharing a vision, and developing strategies for school improvement and high student achievement.
- Significant gains were noted in students' test scores. This, according to the principal, is a result of the implementation of the schoolwide project model. Attendance last year exceeded 90 percent. Other gains noted include increased parental involvement and decreased student suspension rates.
- Interesting activities being implemented that involve students in meaningful learning experiences include peer tutoring, kidwitness news, educational and cultural trips, workshops, and other presentations and assemblies. Students appear enthusiastic and anxious to participate in these events.
- Communication between parents and teachers is enhanced by weekly reports that are sent home. A number of workshops are conducted to train parents to assist their children at home.
- Homework assignments are given to students on weekends.
- A comprehensive kindergarten booklet has been developed and disseminated to all parents of kindergarten students. This booklet contains information for parents on how to prepare their children for school, the objectives of kindergarten, and suggestions for helping children become good listeners and developing a reading atmosphere at home.

Program Improvement at P.S. 213, Brooklyn

P.S. 213 has focused its program improvement efforts on integrating the school's reading program by developing student proficiencies in reading, writing, speaking and by acquainting students with high quality literature and poetry. The use of enrichment materials in the content area strengthens the curriculum. The school also provides supplementary materials for Chapter 1 reading students keyed to pupils' interests and needs.

An on-site trainer provides ongoing staff development on needs assessment, curriculum, the use of enrichment materials in the content areas, and demonstration lessons.

Parents are actively encouraged to become partners in their children's education by becoming involved in the decision-making process in the school. An open house is held specifically for parents of students in instructional support programs. Chapter 1 parents become familiar with their children's teachers and receive a detailed, written summary of program goals and expectations.

Parenting/Communication Skill Workshops also help improve communications between parents and children. The school is focusing on conflict resolution strategies that can be shared with parents. It is anticipated that students will receive consistent messages from home and school to better ensure appropriate attention to potential problems that might affect student performance.

North Carolina

Chapter 1 Participation and Funding Summary

Participation Levels in the 1990-91 School Year

Number of Children Served:	115,526
Percentage of K-12 Children Served:	11%
Number and Percentage of School Districts Receiving Chapter 1 Assistance:	134; 100%
Number and Percentage of Schools Receiving Chapter 1 Assistance:	1,959; 67%

Chapter 1 Services by Grade Span in SY 1990-91

Preschool	2%
Kindergarten	3%
Grades 1-3	29%
Grades 4-6	43%
Grades 7-12	23%

State Funding Levels by School Year

Formula Grants Allocation SY1990-91, 1991-92:	$113,076,233; $134,522,486
Formula Grants Allocation SY 1992-93:	$153,598,445
Chapter 1 Per Pupil Expenditure SY 1990-91:	$942
Program Improvement Allocation SY 1991-92, 1992-93:	$324,904; $564,088

Chapter 1 Program Improvement Summary

Number of Schools in Program Improvement in SY 1991-92

Total Number of Schools Currently in Program Improvement:	465
Percentage of Chapter 1 Schools in Program Improvement:	35%
Number of Schools in Joint Planning:	25

Statewide Minimum Standards for Improvement –One normal curve equivalent (NCE) gain in both basic and advanced skills and substantial progress in meeting the local performance standard for desired outcomes.

Chapter 1 Program Improvement

Leveraging Accountability and Higher Performance

Program Improvement is key to effective Chapter 1 programs in North Carolina because the entire school staff becomes a part of the development of the improvement plan. The evaluation process becomes a dynamic part of the success or failure of the program. The classroom teachers, Chapter 1 teachers, and the school administration are much more aware of their responsibility to educationally disadvantaged children.

The Committee of Practitioners agrees with the current standards for NCE gains and achievement of other desired outcomes. The state education agency (SEA) is encouraging and helping schools establish locally determined desired outcomes in addition to NCE gains on norm-referenced tests through workshops, consultation with individual directors, and the requirement that other desired outcomes be a part of the Chapter 1 project application.

Statewide Technical Assistance

The SEA currently provides the following types of technical assistance to schools identified for improvement: a statewide workshop for teams of educators, parents, and administrators from LEAs (1,060 participants); regional workshops for local directors, teachers, and administrators; on-site visits; consultation and assistance in materials development; and ongoing communication via phone and written correspondence. Through workshops, written materials, and other communications with school districts, the SEA is also providing technical assistance for increasing program emphasis on the development of advanced skills and the adoption of successful instructional models.

The SEA has emphasized program improvement as a very positive opportunity for schools to undertake needed changes in order to foster cooperation in the program improvement process. The SEA has emphasized the Effective Schools view that all schools are either improving or going backwards. Fortunately for Chapter 1 schools, funds are available to assist in the program improvement process. All workshops and consultations emphasize the positive concept of school improvement.

Successful Models

As it assists program improvement schools, the North Carolina Department of Public Instruction sees the following models of curriculum, instructional strategies, and coordination with regular programs: widespread focus on whole language; emphasis on parental involvement and family literacy; computer-assisted instruction, including the use of

take-home computers; emphasis on advanced thinking skills; increased in-class services; more frequent staff development for regular educators; and training for parents.

Exiting Program Improvement

Approximately 66 percent of schools identified for Chapter 1 program improvement based on the 1989-90 testing cycle tested out of the program after the 1990-91 testing cycle. The majority of these schools tested out because of development and at least partial implementation of their program improvement plan. The SEA is encouraging schools that exit program improvement before fully implementing their plans to continue in the program improvement process using their basic or concentration funds.

Joint SEA/LEA Plans

The SEA has assigned a consultant to serve as a member of school improvement teams that develop joint plans with LEAs. Consultants will work as members of the teams to develop, implement, and evaluate the plans. This assistance is supported with state administrative funds. Schools with joint plans are given priority for school improvement funds. The SEA/LEA plans include implementation of successful models. Staff members are feeling very positive about the willingness of individual schools to recognize that the education of Chapter 1 students is the responsibility of the total school and community.

Funding for Program Improvement

All of the program improvement funds are used for mini-grants to LEAs. Approximately 40 percent of state administration staff time is devoted to responsibilities for Chapter 1 program improvement.

Increasing Capacity for School Improvement

The SEAs current staff of eight consultants and one data specialist could easily spend all of their time on program improvement efforts. If on-site, hands-on technical assistance could begin in the first year of school improvement, the SEA estimates that it would not have any schools in joint planning. LEAs and individual schools need ongoing assistance in the planning, development, implementation, and evaluation stages of effective programming for their at-risk students.

Additional Chapter 1 Innovation and Reform

Schoolwide Projects

Number of schoolwide projects in North Carolina by school year:

1989-90	16
1990-91	37
1991-92	66

Thirty-three percent of the 112 schools that were eligible to undertake schoolwide projects in 1990-91 actually undertook them. Regional meetings on Chapter 1 applications emphasized the development of schoolwide projects, and sessions on schoolwide projects were a part of the statewide program improvement workshop. Consultants discuss possibilities and benefits of schoolwide projects during monitoring and application reviews.

Various curricular, instructional, and organizational changes have been made at different schools that have undertaken schoolwide projects. These changes include: implementation of National Diffusion Network projects, additional emphasis on parent involvement training and staff development, use of computer labs, reduction of class size, and implementation of schoolwide reading programs and pre-K programs.

The state now has 115 schools eligible for schoolwide projects at the 75 percent low-income eligibility threshold. The SEA makes the following estimates of the number of schools that would be eligible for schoolwide projects if the threshold were reduced to the following levels: 160 at 60 percent, 450 at 50 percent, and 700 at 40 percent.

Coordination with the Regular Classroom

All workshops, training sessions, monitoring visits, and consultations emphasize the need for coordination between the Chapter 1 and regular classroom teachers. In addition, the SEA is holding six, one-day area workshops across the state to address coordinated services. The first workshop was held in February 21 with 70 participants.

Statewide Coordination

North Carolina has a statewide effort for school improvement called Senate Bill 2. Fortunately, Senate Bill 2 efforts began in 1989-90, the same year that the SEA began Chapter 1 program improvement. Therefore, the state's earliest training emphasized coordination of Chapter 1 and Senate Bill 2 school improvement plans.

All workshops, training sessions, and consultants emphasize the need to coordinate Chapter 1 program improvement with Senate Bill 2 efforts, Chapter 2, and other federal and state programs.

In an effort to streamline administration and paperwork, the SEA will provide the LEAs with summary data for any information that is available at the Department of Public Instruction, such as information on comparability of schools and test data on Chapter 1 students.

The SEA encourages coordination of Chapter 1 services during preschool and early primary years through intensive summer training for teachers and administrators with follow-up during the school year, as well as through regional and statewide workshops. The SEA also makes recommendations on early intervention during monitoring reviews and

is represented on a state-level committee for groups that provide services to North Carolina school children.

Coordination of services is always a major emphasis in SEA technical assistance. A major effort of the North Carolina Department of Public Instruction is the Comprehensive Schools Project through which state-level staff work with individual schools to coordinate all resources to improve programs. With regard to services to limited-English-proficient (LEP) children, the SEA follows the criteria in federal regulations. With regard to special education, state staff encourage local directors of Chapter 1 and special education to work closely together to provide appropriate services for individual children.

Making a Difference School by School

Schoolwide Project at Easton Elementary, Winston-Salem/Forsyth County Schools

The unique features of each grade level in this schoolwide approach are as follows:

- The pre-K program will become The D.A.I.S.Y. Class (Developmentally Appropriate Instruction Supporting the Young). This program, implemented by a teacher and an assistant for fifteen students, will follow developmentally appropriate guidelines. Parents will work in the D.A.I.S.Y. class one hour per week.
- The kindergarten program staffed by a teacher and an assistant will be a developmentally appropriate program, that serves approximately twenty students in each class. There will be an early intervention component, in which the teacher works with small groups of two to three high-risk students during the morning and their parents in the home during the afternoon.

First through fifth grade classes will serve no more than twenty-three students. First and second grade students will receive whole-class, grade-level, whole-language reading instruction. In addition, students will receive forty-five minutes of FROG (Facilitating Reading for Optimum Growth) instruction daily. This format provides intense reading instruction to heterogeneous cooperative learning groups of four students. In addition, the lowest 25 percent of the class will receive one-to-one tutorial instruction daily.

- Third grade students will receive grade-level basal instruction in a heterogeneous, small-group setting. Two primary reading teachers will also tutor individual students who are most at risk. In addition, all students will receive personalized, computer-assisted instruction for forty-five minutes daily.
- Fourth and fifth grade students will receive whole-class, grade-level, whole-language reading instruction. In addition, all students will receive personalized, computer-assisted instruction for forty-five minutes daily.

Many special education students will be blended into the regular education program. Some students will be integrated into regular education classes whenever possible. These "blended" special education students will be based in regular education and individualized education plans will be written by grade-level teams comprised of one certified special education teacher and two regular education teachers.

The school day will be extended to provide before- and after-school enrichment activities. The after-school program will include tutorial as well as enrichment activities such as math tutorial, gymnastics, music, the science club, the garden club, and the technology club.

The school will also undertake special programs such as a summer reading program, a young authors program, and a program to recognize academic achievement.

To meet the wide range of interests, learning styles, and abilities of students, a wide variety of instructional materials and enrichment materials will be available at the school.

Because of high expectations for student achievement, student progress will be monitored and assessed daily. Observations, information tests, unit tests, and grades will be used to determine progress and the need to modify instruction.

If on-site, hands-on technical assistance could begin in the first year of school improvement, the SEA estimates that it would not have any schools in joint plans.

Staff development is a strong component of this project. The principal and the curriculum coordinator will be responsible for supervising the planning and implementation of appropriate staff development activities throughout the school year. A ten-hour workshop on Teaching Reading Strategies/Guided Reading launched the staff development activities for the 1991-92 school year.

There will be a high level of parent involvement in the schoolwide project. A half-time home/school coordinator will be responsible for the planning and implementation of all parent involvement and training, including orientation workshops, regular monthly meetings, training sessions, and the organization of a parent advisory council. When appropriate, the coordinator will make home visits and convene parent/teacher/student conferences.

North Dakota

Chapter 1 Participation and Funding Summary

Participation Levels in School Year (SY) 1990-91

Number of Children Served:	10,037
Percentage of K-12 Children Served:	8%
Number and Percentage of School Districts Receiving Chapter 1 Assistance:	240; 90%
Number and Percentage of Schools Receiving Chapter 1 Assistance:	302; 77%

Chapter 1 Services by Grade Span in SY 1990-91

Preschool	0%
Kindergarten	4%
Grades 1-3	46%
Grades 4-6	34%
Grades 7-12	16%

State Funding Levels by School Year

Formula Grants Allocation SY 1990-91, 1991-92:	$9,791,008; $13,285,888
Formula Grants Allocation SY 1992-93:	$15,021,879
Chapter 1 Per Pupil Expenditure SY 1990-91:	$935
Program Improvement Allocation SY 1991-92; 1992-93:	$90,000; $180,000

Chapter 1 Program Improvement Summary

Number of Schools in Program Improvement in SY 1991-92

Total Number of Schools in Program Improvement:	25
Percentage of Chapter 1 Schools in Program Improvement:	8%
Number of Schools in Joint Planning:	0

Statewide Minimum Standards for Improvement: A gain of two normal curve equivalents (NCEs) in basic and advanced skills and substantial progress in meeting the minimum of one desired outcome for grades K-1 and two desired outcomes for grades 2-6 and 7-12 in both basic and advanced skills in reading and mathematics, if those subject areas are served. One desired outcome in language arts for grades K-1, 2-6, and 7-12, if language arts is served at those grade levels.

Chapter 1 Program Improvement

Leveraging Accountability and Higher Performance

Program improvement is key to effective Chapter 1 programs and school improvement because as schools scrutinize their Chapter 1 programs to determine strengths and weaknesses, they plan and implement needed changes. As a result, the quality and effectiveness of all the school's educational programs are enhanced and improved.

Statewide Technical Assistance

Locally determined desired outcomes are required as part of the local education agency (LEA) application. State staff have provided technical assistance on an individual basis and at workshops to help local Chapter 1 staff develop these desired outcomes. To encourage the use of other objective measures in coordination with the use of NCEs, the state education agency (SEA) has required schools to develop other outcomes, which must be evaluated during the school's local annual review process. LEAs are encouraged to identify schools for program improvement based on both desired outcomes and aggregate achievement.

Sessions that emphasize the positive aspects of program improvement at conferences and workshops are provided using SEA administrative funds. Some sessions are presented by staff from schools currently involved in the program improvement process. Individual technical assistance is provided by state staff at any point during the process as requested by individual schools.

Sessions at conferences and workshops highlight programs that emphasize advanced skills. LEAs currently involved in program improvement are encouraged to designate some program improvement funds for travel and consultation with other LEAs with successful programs.

Although many schools were initially opposed to becoming involved in Chapter 1 program improvement, the majority of LEAs presently do not view program improvement negatively. Schools now in program improvement are more apt to experiment with non-traditional, innovative methods of instruction (for example, whole language, cooperative learning, manipulatives for math, computer-assisted instruction, and in-class models).

The SEA has reduced the potential negative reaction at the local level from identification of schools for program improvement by encouraging LEAs to use program improvement funds to implement models that require an initial outlay of funds that would otherwise not be available.

Schools are increasingly encouraged by the SEA to serve early primary students. This prompting is done through oral and written communications to large and small groups, as well as to individual administrators.

The SEA coordinates Chapter 1 monitoring and compliance requirements with program improvement assistance to the LEAs. Schools are also encouraged to review and address, as appropriate, any compliance issues during the self-study and planning phases of the program improvement process.

Exiting Program Improvement

None of the Chapter 1 schools that have participated in the program improvement process have tested out before full implementation of a school improvement plan. The SEA is encouraging schools to complete the plans in progress even if new data indicate program improvement is no longer needed. State staff provide technical assistance to schools engaged in the process as needed.

Joint SEA/LEA Projects

No joint plans have been funded to date. The first program improvement schools are finishing their first plans during the second year of improvement activities. Joint plans will be started if the need is indicated after the 1991-92 testing cycle. SEA administrative funds will be used as needed to provide technical assistance.

Funding for Program Improvement

All of the program improvement money is being used for mini-grants to LEAs rather than direct SEA technical assistance. Approximately 75 percent of state administrative time is devoted to responsibilities for Chapter 1 program improvement. All of the state technical assistance in program improvement is supported by SEA administrative funds. At this time, no activities have been cut back as a result of increased efforts in program improvement. However, the frequency of compliance monitoring may need to be reduced to allow more time for technical assistance for program improvement schools.

Increasing Capacity for School Improvement

It would be helpful if the SEA had program improvement funds to provide technical assistance, in-service, and other activities for schools without the need to wait for the request to come from a school or group of schools. The current legislation is very restrictive in this regard. Greater flexibility is needed, which allows the SEA to use program improvement funds to provide technical assistance workshops to the schools and LEAs on a regional and individual basis.

The SEA estimates that the following number of schools in the state would become eligible for schoolwide projects if the low income eligibility threshold were reduced from 75 percent to the following levels: 14 schools at 60 percent, 28 schools at 50 percent, and 68 schools at 40 percent.

Coordination with the Regular Classroom

The SEA has approved the appropriate use of Chapter 1 and program improvement funds for LEAs to provide Chapter 1 services in the regular classroom. Sessions at conferences and workshops have also emphasized coordination of services with regular classroom teachers and acquainted Chapter 1 teachers with in-class models. Sessions presented at the annual State Chapter 1 Conference provide teachers with ideas and strategies for working with Chapter 1 students in the regular classroom.

Schools now in program improvement are more apt to experiment with nontraditional, innovative methods of instruction.

Additional Chapter 1 Innovation and Reform

Schoolwide Projects

Number of schoolwide projects in North Dakota by school year:

1989-90	1
1990-91	1
1991-92	1

In North Dakota, eight Chapter 1 schools were eligible for schoolwide projects in the 1990-91 school year.

The SEA makes LEAs aware of the availability of schoolwide programs through written communication and workshops. Technical assistance is provided by telephone, written communication, and on site during the planning phase.

Administrators of schools eligible for schoolwide projects are apprised of national conferences and workshops that focus on schoolwide issues. Continuing assistance is provided upon request during implementation. Whole language, smaller class sizes, and more attention to heritage are some of the changes instituted in the state's single schoolwide project.

Statewide Coordination

The North Dakota School Improvement Process is a voluntary four-step process of planning, team visitation, evaluation, and follow-up. During the planning stage, the Chapter 1 program is evaluated using the assessment tool in the state plan for Chapter 1 program improvement. Schools involved in Chapter 1 program improvement and the follow-up step of the State or North Central Association of Accreditation school improvement process are encouraged to include the Chapter 1 plan as part of their comprehensive plans for school improvement. State staff serve as team members of visitation teams, reviewing and writing the findings for the Chapter 1 component of the school's improvement plan. Chapter 1 teachers also

participate as visitation team members for either the state or NCA accreditation school improvement process. Schools are encouraged to involve the entire reading/language arts staff in the Chapter 1 program improvement process as well.

In order to reduce administrative requirements at the local level, the application, monitoring worksheet and checklist, and other forms have been streamlined to eliminate outdated or repetitive items.

Making a Difference School by School

Program Improvement at Jefferson Elementary School, Minot

The Jefferson Elementary School Chapter 1 staff, regular classroom teachers, school administrators, and parents have worked together to identify two major areas of need and two goals as a focus for program improvement activities. The 10 Effective School practices, the State Chapter 1 Assessment Instrument, and other appropriate input served as the base for the development and planning of appropriate strategies for the school's plan.

The Chapter 1 program self-study process was used to verify parent and community involvement and program and staff leadership as two areas of need. Two comprehensive goals—to increase the academic performance of all Chapter 1 students and to develop and foster the self-esteem of each Chapter 1 child—were also chosen.

The action plan for meeting these needs and goals for the 1991-92 school year includes staff development in areas of: effective teaching, study skills, identifying learning styles, and whole-language and process teaching; monthly parent training sessions on how parents of Chapter 1 students can have a positive effect on their child's success in reading, parent-to-child communication skills, self-esteem, discipline, listening and study skills, and other appropriate topics; expansion of the Read At Home (RAH) program; and an addition of 2.75 full-time equivalents instructional staff positions to provide increased Chapter 1 services for eligible children in the regular classroom.

School staff and parents meet at least once each month in a coordinated and concentrated effort to assess ongoing efforts and to modify or plan new activities. The Chapter 1 staff, regular classroom teachers, administrators, and parents at the Jefferson Elementary School have formed a true partnership to make the Chapter 1 program more effective. All participants agree that the Chapter 1 program improvement process has had a positive effect on the entire school.

Ohio

Chapter 1 Participation and Funding Summary

Participation Levels in School Year (SY) 1990-91

Number of Children Served:	151,347
Percentage of K-12 Children Served:	9%
Number and Percentage of School Districts Receiving Chapter 1 Assistance:	611; 99%
Number and Percentage of Schools Receiving Chapter 1 Assistance:	2,015; 43%

Chapter 1 Services by Grade Span in SY 1990-91:

Preschool	3%
Kindergarten	7%
Grades 1-3	62%
Grades 4-6	23%
Grades 7-12	5%

State Funding Levels by School Year

Formula Grants Allocation SY 1990-91, 1991-92:	$165,715,000; $199,388,668
Formula Grants Allocation SY 1992-93:	$224,682,942
Chapter 1 Per Pupil Expenditure SY 1990-91:	$1,100
Program Improvement Allocation SY 1991-92; 1992-93:	$486,654; $827,011

Chapter 1 Program Improvement Summary

Number of Schools in Program Improvement in SY 1991-92

Total Number of Schools in Program Improvement:	264
Percentage of Chapter 1 Schools in Program Improvement:	11%
Number of Schools in Joint Planning:	1

Statewide Minimum Standards for Improvement: Normal curve equivalent (NCE) gain in basic and advanced skills and substantial progress in achieving locally determined desired outcomes.

Chapter 1 Program Improvement

Leveraging Accountability and Higher Performance

Chapter 1 program improvement provides an opportunity for district personnel to make targeted improvements in their programs. Supporting research based change gears programs toward education of Chapter 1 at-risk students. Because the framework of program improvement encourages these very processes, (e.g., focus on student outcomes, examination of data, and a coordinated team effort on the part of teachers, parents, and administrators to address the needs of students in identified buildings), meaningful, long-term educational changes can be made. To sustain improvements at the building level, program improvement efforts continue in many buildings even though the letter of the Chapter 1 law has been met. Chapter 1 leadership in this area has raised issues of high expectations for at-risk children to the attention of teachers and administrators who operate outside of Chapter 1, but who deal with at-risk children.

Statewide Technical Assistance

The SEA encourages schools to establish other desired outcomes. Examples are provided at workshops, sent with the annual application forms, and explained during technical assistance sessions and program reviews.

The SEA gives technical assistance to schools identified for program improvement during workshops, regional and state meetings, on-site visits, and through printed information disseminated to the schools. All state consultants are involved in the process. In order to foster the use of advanced skills, the SEA: encourages schools to use advanced skill materials developed by the Technical Assistance Center (TAC), emphasizes close coordination of the district's curriculum; sponsors state-level conference sessions that address advanced skills, and sends state publications on advanced skills to all schools.

In order to reduce any negative reactions at the local level accompanying the identification of schools for program improvement, the SEA conducts regional meetings for Chapter 1 coordinators and principals involved in program improvement.

Exiting Program Improvement

The SEA requires schools that have exited program improvement to follow through with the process and fully implement their plans. This is verified through program reviews, monitoring, and by checking expenditures on reports submitted by the districts.

Joint SEA/LEA Plans

SEA and LEA representatives meet with the building committees from each school identified for joint planning to review and modify the program improve-

ment plans as needed. On-site technical assistance and in-service sessions will be provided in curriculum and instruction, and staff development at the school level will be required if it has not been a part of the original plan. The assistance will be supported by program improvement funds.

Funding for Program Improvement

Districts on a spring/spring testing cycle have earlier access to program improvement funds than schools on a fall/fall testing cycle. Mini-grants to LEAs account for 98 percent of program improvement money.

Because of the increased attention devoted to program improvement, the SEA has less time for monitoring, reviews, and providing other technical assistance. However, the SEA is able to coordinate auditing reviews with program improvement responsibilities by checking on the program improvement progress of schools and students during monitoring.

Increasing Capacity for School Improvement

In evaluating its capacity to meet the mission of program improvement, the SEA states a need for additional staff. Program improvement requirements have increased the amount of data management, monitoring, and assistance that must be provided to each identified building. Additional resources are needed so that the SEA can ensure that plans are well developed, follow the progress of identified schools, provide program improvement assistance, and work with districts on joint plans. Beyond meeting current essential needs, additional funds would make it possible for the SEA to work with identified schools in the following areas: alternative instructional strategies such as cooperative learning and peer tutoring, parent involvement as it relates to instruction, more advanced skills in reading and mathematics, assessment, personnel training for work with at-risk kids, and on-site analysis and development of program improvement plans.

Additional Chapter 1 Innovation and Reform

Schoolwide Projects

Number of schoolwide projects in Ohio by school year:

1989-90	14
1990-91	36
1991-92	60

The SEA estimates that 226 schools were eligible for schoolwide projects in SY 1990-91. There has been a substantial increase in the number of schoolwide projects over the last three school years. Significant school developments due to the implementation of schoolwide projects include better coordination, and the use of team approaches and multiple learning strategies. In order to encourage the development of schoolwide projects, the SEA: sponsors an annual state-level schoolwide meeting for participating and potential projects, sends mailings with schoolwide information, facilitates inter-district schoolwide visits, and features articles on schoolwide projects in SEA publications.

The SEA has noted during visits to both program improvement schools and schoolwide projects that the most commonly used school model is Effective Schools. The SEA does not encourage the use of any specific models but helps schools to incorporate successful models through its funding allocations and assistance in developing successful plans.

The SEA makes the following estimates of the number of schools that would be eligible for schoolwide projects if the low-income threshold were lowered from the 75 percent to the following levels: 488 schools at 60 percent, 696 schools at 50 percent, and 986 schools at 40 percent.

Coordination with the Regular Classroom

Coordination of the Chapter 1 and regular classroom instruction has been a focus of the Ohio Chapter 1 program for several years. The SEA promotes coordination with the regular classroom via on-site reviews (monitoring), publications distributed monthly and quarterly, telephone contacts, state and regional meeting presentations, and specific questions on the application. LEAs are encouraged to provide in-class services, a combination of in-class and pull-out services, or whatever best fits their needs.

The SEA facilitates mentoring and networking among districts statewide. District staff are encouraged to visit schools that have successfully coordinated services in the regular classroom. The state Chapter 1 meeting serves as a demonstration site where the LEAs that have been most successful in the coordinating effort present their methods and philosophies to other LEAs.

The Mayfair staff is committed to working in teams to maximize resources for all students.

An SEA-published handbook provides guidance for coordinators and other materials on coordination are distributed by the TAC. Individual SEA consultants conduct district, county, and multi-county workshops, which encompass the coordination effort and ways in which teachers can work together in the regular classroom.

The FY 93 Chapter 1 application was thoroughly discussed at regional meetings throughout the state, and it was made very clear that LEAs have the flexibility to provide services wherever they would be beneficial to the students.

Chapter 1 and classroom teachers as well as principals and parents understand the positive results of coordination. The SEA monitors the coordination of instruction during on-site program reviews. If there is a prob-

lem, the SEA consultant works with the teachers and administrators to assist them in understanding the goals of Chapter 1 and achieving the coordination effort.

Statewide Coordination

Ohio's state compensatory education program, the Disadvantaged Pupil Program Funds (DPPF), operates in much the same manner as Chapter 1. For example, it complements Chapter 1 by picking up the slack when Chapter 1 services cannot serve all eligible students in a school. If a needs assessment deems that Chapter 1 services be concentrated in the elementary grades, DPPF might provide supplementary services at the middle level.

Chapter 1 school improvement was in place before state school improvement left the ground. Ohio has encouraged districts to coordinate, rather than duplicate, services from both programs. There are possibilities for cross-functional activities between the two staffs, which have begun to take place with the emphasis on SEA coordination of program and efforts. The Dayton City School District is an excellent example and serves as model of this endeavor. Under the leadership of the superintendent, a massive staff development effort is underway. Chapter 1 program improvement funds are used, Chapter 1 guidelines are met, and the effort is coordinated throughout the district. Universities are involved in the ongoing process.

Ohio identifies effective and deficient schools on a yearly basis via test results. Although schools go through separate program improvement efforts, and the DPPF program is very new, they are encouraged to combine all areas possible. Committees formed could serve the necessary functions required for Chapter 1 and state school improvement, strategies could be coordinated, and the goals could encompass student needs in both programs for a concentrated effort on the part of teachers and students. It is interesting to note that many buildings identified for Chapter 1 program improvement are not the same buildings identified for the state school improvement process.

Differences between the two programs inhibit coordination of monitoring requirements. The Chapter 1 office conducts a monitoring program in which the Chapter 1 projects are monitored, with a few exceptions, on a regular, on-site basis, by individual consultants and/or teams of consultants. DPPF do not follow such schedules nor do they have support from a strong law and the regulation such as Chapter 1 does.

The SEA has an employee who works as a liaison with testing and evaluation personnel to learn what efforts are being made and how Chapter 1 can fit into the program. LEAs are encouraged to write desired outcomes that relate to the district accountability effort.

The SEA encourages coordination of Chapter 1 program improvement with a number of other programs. The Chapter 2 office has distributed information on ways in which these programs can be coordinated. To coordinate early childhood programs, the SEA has appointed a liaison to facilitate communication between preschool, early childhood, and Chapter 1 programs. The SEA has encouraged LEAs to target services for children in preschool through the early elementary grades as a preventative measure against later educational difficulties. In the first unified, visible effort to demonstrate to LEAs that coordination of preschool education was underway, SEA preschool and Chapter 1 personnel recently participated in a state pre-conference session, which included university experts and practitioners from the field.

All laws, regulations, guidance, and policy manuals concerning special and bilingual education programs have been distributed to LEAs. Representatives from the various programs are invited to make presentations during state meetings held by the various funding sources. A consultant works with the special education department to facilitate communication between Chapter 1 and special education programs and to monitor use of funds between the two programs.

In Ohio, there are three levels of services for students with limited English proficiency; levels A, B, and C. When students reach level C, they are no longer having difficulties solely as a result of a language barrier, but rather due to educational reasons. If these children qualify for Chapter 1 services, they are provided services in addition to the services they receive through the LEP program.

Ohio's mandates concerning children with disabilities are in fact more stringent than federal mandates. Chapter 1 regulations indicate that an LEA may not use Chapter 1 funds to provide services that are required by federal, state, or local law to overcome children's handicapping conditions or limited English proficiency. Learning disabled children are not served in Chapter 1. However, due to the manner in which the Ohio law is written, children with speech and hearing difficulties, as well as some physically handicapped children receive Chapter 1 services. Students who have been identified as learning disabled but whose parents refuse to sign the placement, are not considered special education students, but may be served in Chapter 1 if they qualify.

Making a Difference School by School

Schoolwide Project at Mayfair Elementary, Cleveland

The Mayfair faculty is committed to working in teams to maximize resources for all students. Four instructional teams of teachers, aides, classified staff, and parent volunteers serve the project. Each team consists of representatives from grades K-6 and special classes.

The following components address

specific areas identified in the needs assessment: a reading/math resource teacher to serve grades K-6, an instructional aide to serve grades K-6 on computer-assisted instruction under the direction of the classroom teacher, an instructional aide work with small groups and provide individual tutoring to help reinforce skills, an instructional aide for regular and extended-day kindergarten classes, an open library media center to strengthen the whole-language reading program and give students the opportunity to do in-depth study projects, and a lead teacher to coordinate building activities.

Schoolwide support services include a full-time counselor, school psychologist, and home-school liaison or parent coordinator funded through Chapter 1. Services provided by the counselor and psychologist are in addition to services already provided by the district.

The school's mission statement calls for a strong sense of leadership among the staff. Teachers are empowered to plan and solve problems. Students receive academic information through teacher team monitoring and progress reports. They also receive self-esteem training. Parents participate in parent training and support groups. All staff members are involved in planning and decision making.

Program Improvement at Hickorydale Elementary, Dayton

An eight- to ten- member facilitation team provides continual input at the school level in assessing needs and planning, carrying out, and monitoring the School Improvement Plan (SIP). The team has implemented instructional improvement concepts and techniques through staff development and related activities at the school site.

Wright State University provides a facilitator who is responsible for chairing the team. In-service training for the team has been followed by staff development training for teachers. As a result, teachers see themselves not as mere dispensers of knowledge, but as managers of student learning through alternative instruction and learning styles.

The number of parents serving as volunteers and attending parent meetings has increased. Parents are supported in their efforts by the school's provision of space, materials, telephone access, and incentives.

Through a steady emphasis on reshaping teachers' attitudes and on student learning styles, the school is no longer identified for program improvement activities. Even though the effort has been successful, the school continues to work on a school improvement plan to ensure that improvements will continue.

Oklahoma

Chapter 1 Participation and Funding Summary

Participation Levels in the 1990-1991 School Year

Number of Children Served:	66,637
Percentage of K-12 Children Served:	10%
Number and Percentage of School Districts Receiving Chapter 1 Assistance:	576; 97%
Number and Percentage of Schools Receiving Chapter 1 Assistance:	1,111; 60%

Chapter 1 Services by Grade Span in SY 1990-91

Preschool	1%
Kindergarten	3%
Grades 1-3	39%
Grades 4-6	38%
Grades 7-12	19%

State Funding Levels by School Year

Formula Grants Allocation SY 1990-91, 1991-92:	$46,595,383; $54,058,507
Formula Grants Allocation SY 1992-93:	$59,600,648
Chapter 1 Per Pupil Expenditure SY 1990-91:	$630
Program Improvement Allocation SY 1991-92, 1992-93:	$129,517; $216,746

Chapter 1 Program Improvement Summary

Number of Schools in Program Improvement in SY 1991-92

Total Number of Schools in Program Improvement:	93
Percentage of Chapter 1 Schools in Program Improvement:	8%
Number of Schools in Joint Planning:	3

Statewide Minimum Standards for Improvement: A gain greater than zero normal curve equivalents (NCEs) in both basic and advanced skills.

Chapter 1 Program Improvement

Leveraging Accountability and Higher Performance

Chapter 1 Program Improvement requirements have provided a framework to bring about improved instructional techniques, improved parental involvement, and most importantly, improved student achievement. The development of each plan has also brought about a better understanding of Chapter 1 and improved coordination between the Chapter 1 program and the regular program of instruction. It has been observed that schools have utilized the requirement of improvement of a Chapter 1 program to bring about improvement across the school and not just in the Chapter 1 program.

The state education agency (SEA) recommends that each local education agency (LEA) establish a gain of at least one NCE in both basic and advanced skills. All districts have adopted this standard or higher standards on a voluntary basis.

The SEA has also encouraged schools to establish desired outcomes other than NCE gains through application workshops, annual Chapter 1 conferences, and technical assistance provided to LEAs.

The Committee of Practitioners has discouraged the SEA from setting higher standards and instead favored encouraging LEAs to raise their local standards.

Statewide Technical Assistance

The SEA provides workshops to develop awareness of program requirements as well as procedures to be followed in order for LEAs to meet their responsibilities for program improvement. In addition, Chapter 1 staff are available to assist in the development of program improvement plans. The SEA also makes curriculum staff available to assist in plan development and implementation.

The Annual Chapter 1 Conference sessions are specifically designed to address advanced skills and focus on exemplary programs and practices. These sessions are presented by exemplary LEA Chapter 1 staff and personnel made available through federally funded Technical Assistance Centers (TAC).

To help reduce any potential negative association with identification for program improvement, the SEA emphasizes the use of Chapter 1 improvement funds to bring about overall improvement of a curriculum in the school.

Exiting Program Improvement

Of the schools identified for program improvement, fifty-six tested out before their plans were fully implemented. Of those schools, the SEA estimates that 75 percent improved because of at least partial implementation of their improvement plans.

The SEA encourages schools through in-service meetings and communication with LEAs to continue implementing their plans even if they have tested out of program improvement.

Joint SEA/LEA Plans

Following the identification of a school required to develop a joint improvement plan, the SEA assigns individuals to participate in the development of the plan and visit the school periodically to determine implementation status. The SEA will also provide curriculum specialists upon request. Chapter 1 state administration funds and SEA funds are utilized to provide services related to the joint plan. Following the development of the joint plan, program improvement funds are allocated if requested in the plan. Funds allocated for program improvement and funds available for reallocation are the only additional funds available for use in program improvement. The goals often stated in joint plans include increased parental involvement, closer coordination of services, better testing skills, and use of evaluation data. The results of the joint plans will not be known until the end of this school year.

Funding for Program Improvement

All of the 1990-91 program improvement funds have been allocated. The requirement that identified LEAs must agree to the use of program improvement funds does not allow the SEA to develop program improvement activities or hire staff with the expertise in the areas of staff or curriculum development prior to identification of a program in need of improvement. Program improvement funds are only allocated to requesting LEAs following the review of the LEA's program improvement plan. The allocation to each LEA is made in the form of a mini-grant and is only made as requested by the LEA.

It is estimated that 15 percent of all Chapter 1 administrative time is spent on program improvement activities. All expenses required to provide state technical assistance as well as administrative activities related to program improvement are supported by Chapter 1 administration funds.

In order to implement program improvement requirements, the state has reduced its efforts to monitor programs for compliance. The SEA feels that this weakens program effectiveness across the state. Compliance monitoring includes the review of the status of an improvement plan in only those schools scheduled for monitoring that are also implementing improvement plans. There is no emphasis on monitoring LEAs that are not carrying out improvement plans.

Increasing Capacity for School Improvement

The greatest need at the SEA level is the availability of staff to devote a major portion of time to the implementation of program improvement activities. The present allocation of funds appears to be adequate for all requests for program improvement; however, this would not be true if the minimum state standard were to be raised, thus identifying more schools for improvement.

Additional Chapter 1 Innovation and Reform

Schoolwide Projects

Number of schoolwide projects in Oklahoma by school year:

1989-90	6
1990-91	6
1991-92	7

During the 1990-91 school year, fifty-eight schools qualified for schoolwide projects.

In order to encourage the implementation of schoolwide projects, the SEA notifies schools of their eligibility to develop and implement a schoolwide project. A workshop is held that provides information on schoolwide requirements as well as ideas for schoolwide projects. In addition, all eligible schools are invited to regional schoolwide conferences.

The SEA has provided technical assistance during schoolwide program development and facilitated additional assistance from the TAC.

Instructional changes in schoolwide projects in the state include lower class sizes for reading and mathematics, an all-day kindergarten, and implementation of a computerized instructional program. The instructional change that has resulted in significant improvement was the implementation of the all-day kindergarten program.

The instructional change that has resulted in significant improvement was the implementation of the all-day kindergarten program.

The SEA estimates that the following number of schools would be eligible for schoolwide projects if the low-income eligibility threshold were reduced from 75 percent to the following levels: 217 schools at 60 percent, 402 schools at 50 percent, and 637 schools at 40 percent.

Coordination with the Regular Classroom

The SEA does not encourage or discourage Chapter 1 services in the regular classroom. LEAs are aware of all delivery systems and are provided technical assistance for schools requesting additional information related to the delivery of Chapter 1 programs. In addition, during the annual statewide Chapter 1 conferences, presentations describe all delivery systems and help Chapter 1 and regular classroom teachers teach Chapter 1 children. LEAs are made aware of coordination requirements as well as the

benefits derived through well-coordinated instructional programs.

Statewide Coordination

The SEA used Chapter 1 program improvement materials and procedures to develop school improvement procedures for schools that the state identified as at risk. Coordination of state improvement activities occurs when the Chapter 1 improvement plan adopts techniques described in school improvement plans, when plans are developed by the same individual, or when plans are developed during the same period of time. Better coordination would be obtained if the identification of schools at risk and Chapter 1 programs in need of improvement were to occur at the same time. This dual identification would allow teachers to plan one time to improve their programs and use Chapter 1 funds in coordination with local funds to improve faulty instructional programs.

In order to streamline program administration, all paperwork is reviewed by a committee prior to its use. In addition, a new computerized accounting system is being implemented to remove additional paperwork. The SEA reviews all applications, evaluations, and other data-gathering materials to remove unneeded requests for information.

At this time there is very little coordination of Chapter 1 and Head Start programs. In limited instances, however, LEAs have used Chapter 1 funds to implement early childhood programs that connect Head Start and public schools. Through discussions with LEA administrators, it is estimated that there will be an increase in the number of Early Childhood programs funded partially or totally through Chapter 1 funds.

LEAs have been made aware of procedures described by the U.S. Department of Education for coordinating Chapter 1, special education, and bilingual education funding. It is recommended that students with limited English proficiency (LEP) be served in Chapter 1 programs when the need being addressed is not overcoming a language barrier.

LEAs have been made aware of the possibility for coordination between Chapter 1 and special education services. LEAs have also been made aware of the mandate to address handicapping conditions through funds other than Chapter 1. A review of students served and the procedures used to provide these services do not indicate a great deal of coordination of funding sources.

Making a Difference School by School

Program Improvement at Hobart Public Schools, Hobart

Hobart Public Schools had two sites identified for program improvement for the 1990-91 school year. The Frances Willard Elementary, grades 1-3 math and reading programs were in program improvement and Eugene Field Elementary grades 4 and 5 math program were in program improvement. A needs assessment was conducted at both sites and committees were established to plan the program. A program for tracking students' math and reading skills was developed using the Individual Criteria Referenced Test. A Parent Partners program was initiated. Parents are encouraged to check out an educational device to reinforce math and reading skills. Students are to use the device at home for a maximum of two weeks before the parent is required to return to school for a progress report. At that time, the parent may re-check the device. A parent/teacher resource center was established. It has collected commercial and teacher-made materials. When teachers confer with parents, they can demonstrate to the parents how to work with their child at home. These materials may also be checked out by the parents to use at home.

Two teachers trained in Teacher Expectations of Student Achievement (TESA) will train the local staff in TESA. In addition, teachers from the Madill Public School system were contracted to conduct an in-service on outcome-based education (OBE). The Chapter 1 teachers as well as the regular classroom teachers are enthusiastic about the new materials and approaches to foster student learning and parental involvement. The in-service training has been very beneficial. The introduction to OBE has been the catalyst for a great deal of interest and further study of OBE. Schools are seeing improvement of their students as a result of developing and implementing their program improvement plans.

Oregon

Chapter 1 Participation and Funding Summary

Participation Levels in School Year (SY) 1990-91

Number of Children Served:	44,693
Percentage of K-12 Children Served:	9%
Number of School Districts Receiving Chapter 1 Assistance:	297
Number and Percentage of Schools Receiving Chapter 1 Assistance:	790, 68%

Chapter 1 Services by Grade Span in SY 1990-91

Preschool	<1%
Kindergarten	3%
Grades 1-3	46%
Grades 4-6	28%
Grades 7-12	22%

State Funding Levels by School Year

Formula Grants Allocation SY 1990-91, 1991-92:	$38,312,811; $43,294,628
Formula Grants Allocation SY 1992-93:	$47,757,431
Chapter 1 Per Pupil Expenditure SY 1990-91:	$1,239
Program Improvement Allocation SY 1991-92, 1992-93:	$136,906; $224,715

Chapter 1 Program Improvement

Number of Schools in Program Improvement in SY 1991-92

Total Number of Schools in Program Improvement:	27
Percentage of Chapter 1 Schools in Program Improvement:	3%
Number of Schools in Joint Planning:	1

Statewide Minimum Standards for Improvement: One normal curve equivalent (NCE) gain or better in basic and advanced skills and success in achieving one other locally developed desired outcome approved by the state.

Chapter 1 Program Improvement

Leveraging Accountability and Higher Performance

The SEA has found that when a school is placed in program improvement, the first question addressed is whether the problem exists solely with the Chapter 1 staff or exists in the entire building. At least 50 percent of the time, the plan is to use Chapter 1 as the framework for building level improvement.

The SEA had higher standards in 1989. There was a three-year program to reach three NCEs for high schools, four NCEs for middle schools, and five NCEs for elementary schools, but the schools asked the Committee of Practitioners (COP) to lower the levels because they felt that there would be a negative impact if too many schools were brought into the process. The COP has discouraged high levels of statewide standards and desired outcomes.

The SEA would like to go back to the higher level, but that will depend upon the recommendation of the COP and the SEA. District staff members are enthusiastic about program improvement, but they would also like to see recognition for outstanding achievement.

Statewide Technical Assistance

The SEA sponsors workshops designed to help districts write desired outcomes and learn to use standardized test data effectively. One of the most difficult problems is managing the individual student growth requirement and keeping staff tuned in to the need for record keeping and data analysis. Desired outcomes have significantly increased the staff's paperwork in most cases, requiring more time than was required to simply use and report data from standardized tests. The SEA staff supports the establishment of other desired outcomes, but the variety of the outcomes require that virtually every staff member have a different record keeping system. The SEA finds that too many of the systems are not methodical and precise. Program improvement review is a critical part of the monitoring process.

The SEA has made several types of technical assistance available. Technical Assistance Centers (TACs) offer consultations to both schools and their parent districts. Specialized consultants in program implementation are available for on-site consultation, and SEA staff coordinate communication between effective school programs and those in program improvement.

The SEA has offered annual statewide training activities to emphasize higher-level skills. The SEA requires local schools to report only on higher-order skills, unless the local program falls behind in higher-order skills. The TACs are also encouraged to put on workshops.

At the time that Hawkins Stafford requirements went into effect, the SEA started a series of regional breakfast meetings for Chapter 1 staff in Oregon. The primary topic of interest in these ac-

tivities was program improvement.

One of the most effective tools of the SEA, which has been in use for at least eight years, has been the annual publication of what a superintendent or principal should expect in NCE gains in the various grade spans and the percentage of students that should be exiting any effective program at each grade level. The SEA has also done a study of outstanding Chapter 1 programs in Oregon. Those results have been summarized and distributed statewide.

The SEA is having outstanding success with Chapter 1 teachers combining skill instruction with teaching the vocabulary and other skills in lessons the students are going to encounter two weeks later. This is especially true of vocabulary in mathematics, reading, science, and social studies (which includes history and geography). This tactic makes the students feel that they know as much or more than the children not in Chapter 1. Good diagnosis is a key to finding out exactly what it is the students already know so that time is not wasted reteaching learned material.

Exiting Program Improvement

Approximately 60 percent of schools identified for program improvement tested out before the improvement plan was implemented. The SEA encourages schools to continue the program improvement process by making improvement funds available for up to three years. However, less than ten schools have taken this offer.

Funding for Program Improvement

All of the program improvement funds are being used for mini-grants. Approximately 20 percent of Chapter 1 administrative staff time is being used for program improvement. All of the SEA technical assistance comes from state administrative funds.

Increasing Capacity for School Improvement

The state of Oregon is currently undergoing a significant restructuring of services. The funds available for state administration and program improvement may not be adequate. The SEA has too few staff to concentrate on program improvement in the Chapter 1 program at this time.

Additional Chapter 1 Innovation and Reform

Schoolwide Projects

Number of schoolwide projects in Oregon by school year:

1989-90	8
1990-91	10
1991-92	11

According to the State Department of Education, fifteen Chapter 1 schools were eligible for schoolwide projects in 1990-91.

To support the development of schoolwide projects, the SEA calls meetings of eligible districts, paid for with state administrative funds, and gives the eligible schools model applications and assistance from staff members in schools already in the process. The SEA provides preliminary reviews of applications, helps design effective programs, and conducts on-site visits to answer questions regarding flexibility. As a result of schoolwide projects, Chapter 1 staff members are moving into the regular classrooms to assist teachers and act as a schoolwide resource in reading and mathematics. Equipment purchased with Chapter 1 funds is also moving into the regular classrooms.

No schools have been excluded to date due to maintenance of effort requirements. So far, the SEA has only had one building finish the three-year cycle. Data about that building points to a trend of the program becoming less and less effective each year during the three-year cycle. The SEA is going to require that the school reorganize and submit a new plan.

The SEA makes the following estimates of the number of schools that would be eligible for schoolwide projects if the low-income eligibility threshold requirements were reduced from 75 percent to the following levels: 80 schools at 60 percent, 122 schools at 50 percent, 250 schools at 40 percent.

Coordination with the Regular Classroom

Chapter 1 law specifically prohibits the state from encouraging any particular delivery model or any particular delivery of service. The SEA informs the LEAs about learning theory and the models of proven effectiveness as measured by the evaluation of delivery models, but does not recommend in-class, pull-out, or computer-assisted instruction over direct instruction or whole language over phonics or any other delivery system. The SEA gives the LEA the pros and cons as identified from research at the state level and in the literature.

Program improvement review is a critical part of the monitoring process.

During monitoring visits, the SEA visits with classroom teachers so that monitors can test whether or not schools are coordinating instructional activities with the classroom.

It has been a long-standing procedure in Oregon that the state Chapter 1 staff speak to the teacher preparation classes about reading education. In that setting they make a point about Chapter 1 staff and regular classroom staff cooperating to meet the needs of the children. For more than ten years, the statewide training effort was spearheaded by an annual activity for all staff at a central point. The SEA has moved

from that procedure to joint efforts with professional associations to carry out staff training.

Statewide Coordination

While Oregon does not have a building-level program improvement effort, the state does have a program in place to restructure education. A significant part of that effort includes placing more emphasis on the prevention of educational disadvantagement and targeting the significant efforts of Chapter 1 to preschool or early childhood programs. The state also has a statewide achievement test; the SEA believes that it will be able to use the data from the test to meet the Chapter 1 evaluation requirements.

There is a state compensatory education program that serves only one school district—Portland. In that case, the program is closely coordinated with Chapter 1 services as well as desegregation goals. There are no state goals or accountability requirements for the program.

Chapter 1 program improvement efforts have frequently been tied to Chapter 2 programs at the local level; however, the SEA has not required this cooperation.

The SEA utilizes a three-year application process and has reduced the updating process to an application that addresses only targeting, budgeting, and maintenance of effort. The SEA asks for no program information unless the LEA indicates that there has been a change in delivery systems. It is a state goal that providing information about items other than targeting and fiscal matters should require no more than thirty minutes.

The SEA has a Head Start transition grant and the Chapter 1 staff has worked with that group to encourage transition programs in schools that have a Chapter 1 program at the kindergarten or preschool level. The state is encouraging schools to use Chapter 1 funds to supplement the Head Start funds where educationally disadvantaged children are not being served by Head Start programs. The state also has a significant Oregon Pre-kindergarten program.

Chapter 1 is picking up level three and four students as measured on the Language Ability and Skills test and is providing instruction in those basic skills in which the non English-speaking children are educationally disadvantaged. The state staff is in the same office so they can confer daily with Chapter 1 staff members. The two staffs coordinate activities at weekly staff meetings.

Building-level Chapter 1 staff members are assigned to multi-disciplinary teams that make decisions regarding Chapter 1 and special education students. Because of the budget crunch and current instructional theory, many school districts are mainstreaming special education children and serving those children with consulting special education staff rather than providing more segregated assistance. Chapter 1 services are provided when special education children are performing below grade level and are identified as educationally disadvantaged. This practice is a trend however, and not a universal pattern throughout Oregon.

Schoolwide Project at Whiteaker Community School, Eugene

Whiteaker Community School has been designated by the Oregon Department of Education as the most disadvantaged elementary school in Oregon based on the number of students receiving free and reduced lunch (91%), yearly student turnover, and average daily attendance. Whiteaker has also enrolled eighty-six children from various shelters for the homeless this year. Despite the high percentage of at-risk children at Whiteaker, California Test of Basic Skills scores are at the state average.

On-site are the K-5 school, two Head Start classrooms and a preschool infant/toddler center. Whiteaker is the only Oregon site for the Accelerated School program and one of the five sites for the Northwest Regional Lab/Oregon Department of Education pilot on transitioning students from Head Start to Kindergarten. Whiteaker is also being considered as a pilot site for integration of social services into schools.

As a Chapter 1 schoolwide project, the staff has set the following goals: improving test scores in reading and math; improving self-esteem and instilling a feeling of self-worth in both students and their parents; implementing a discipline program where students, not teachers, make choices; providing students with a stable environment that provides a sense of security; empowering parents to become actively involved in the education of their children; and continuing to develop collaborative relationships with other public agencies.

Staff currently work with Catholic Community Services, St. Vincent De Paul housing, the Eugene Police Department, Birth to Three, and other community agencies.

Implementation of Whiteaker's schoolwide program includes the following program components:

- language-based kindergarten that includes lunch,
- implementation training for both parents and staff on the Accelerated Schools model,
- after-school learning/recreational activities,
- development of a community case management model to include public and local non-profit agencies,
- cross-grade placement in reading and math with both teaching and firm-up instruction each day in both areas,
- classroom focus on nutrition, including cooking and health classes for at least 40 percent of the students,
- maintenance of small class sizes,
- computer instruction at least two days per week,
- implementation of school-based family activities,
- implementation of a schoolwide self-esteem program, and
- development of a schoolwide discipline program.

Pennsylvania

Chapter 1 Participation and Funding Summary

Participation Levels in School Year (SY) 1990-91

Number of Children Served:	220,772
Percentage of K-12 Children Served:	29%
Number and Percentage of School Districts Receiving Chapter 1 Assistance:	499; 99%
Number and Percentage of Schools Receiving Chapter 1 Assistance:	2,312; 75%

Chapter 1 Services by Grade Span in SY 1990-91

Preschool	<1%
Kindergarten	5%
Grades 1-3	41%
Grades 4-6	31%
Grades 7-12	22%

State Funding Levels by School Year

Formula Grants Allocation SY 1990-91, 1991-92:	$231,833,560; $275,159,840
Formula Grants Allocation SY 1992-93:	$304,090,451
Chapter 1 Per Pupil Expenditure SY 1990-91:	$1,050
Program Improvement Allocation SY 1991-92,1992-93:	$696,885; $1,155,526

Chapter 1 Program Improvement Summary

Number of Schools in Program Improvement in SY 1991-92

Total Number of Schools in Program Improvement:	627
Percentage of Chapter 1 Schools in Program Improvement:	28%
Number of Schools in Joint Planning:	28

Statewide Minimum Standards for Improvement: Greater than zero normal curve equivalent (NCE) gain for basic and advanced skills, a mean NCE gain for each grade level, and substantial progress in achieving success in the regular program and attainment of grade-level proficiency.

Chapter 1 Program Improvement

Leveraging Accountability and Higher Performance

The Pennsylvania State Department of Education strongly supports program improvement because it has forced schools to review whether the building, grade level, and students' programs need change. Because 65 percent of the buildings have been identified for program improvement for not making substantial progress in achieving locally developed desired outcomes, local education agencies (LEAs) and buildings are carefully reviewing appropriate measures to assess the effectiveness of their learning outcomes.

The Chapter 1 Committee of Practitioners was involved in the implementation of the current standards for aggregate score and desired outcomes.

Statewide Technical Assistance

The state education agency (SEA) is helping schools to establish effective, locally developed desired outcomes through SEA regional meetings, Technical Assistance Center (TAC) workshops, on-site program improvement visits, and consultants. LEA and school personnel are looking at what students should know and alternative measures of assessing the effectiveness of Chapter 1 programs as they relate to the basic program of the building. A major difficulty has been the inability of building staff to develop locally desired outcomes, along with appropriate measures of assessment of their outcomes.

The SEA is currently providing technical assistance to schools identified for improvement through TAC workshops, staff on-site monitoring visits, consultants, Research for Better Schools (RBS), and effective practice workshops.

The SEA has emphasized a positive approach in an effort to reduce any potential negative association at the local level accompanying identification of schools for program improvement. Each school building that has been identified for program improvement has been visited by and has had meetings conducted by SEA staff in order to foster LEA cooperation.

Exiting Program Improvement

While dedicated to the program improvement concept, the Pennsylvania Department of Education is concerned that 83 percent of Pennsylvania schools identified for Chapter 1 program improvement based on the 1989-90 testing cycle tested out of program improvement before their plans were fully implemented. In order to hedge against schools leaving the program improvement process before their program improvement plans are implemented, the SEA encourages LEAs to implement a plan for the full year and to continue with implementation after testing out of program improvement.

Joint SEA/LEA Plans

Joint plans are developed by identified school in conjunction with SEA staff. SEA staff visit the building and meet with a team (usually the principal, Chapter 1 teacher, instructional support teacher, and classroom teachers) to determine what happened with implementation of the program improvement plan and to assess the need for additional changes. Based on this meeting and a review of changes, competitive funds will be awarded to implement the plan.

Funding for Program Improvement

Ninety-nine percent of the 1990-91 program improvement funds have been distributed. The only factor slowing the distribution and expenditure of program improvement funds was a lack of SEA support staff. Approximately one-third of the program improvement money is being distributed through competitive mini-grants, and the balance is per an allocation process. In 1991-92, one-third will be allocation, and two-thirds will be competitive. Sixty percent of Chapter 1 state administration time is devoted to program improvement. A significantly higher percentage of state technical assistance in program improvement is supported by state adminlstration funds rather than program improvement funds.

Chapter 1 compliance monitoring has been significantly cut back as a result of increased attention to program improvement. The SEA monitoring instrument concentrates on curriculum alignment as opposed to compliance requirements.

Increasing Capacity for School Improvement

To increase capacity for change, additional dollars would be used to support development of desired learning outcomes, which accurately assess what children should and do know.

Additional Chapter 1 Innovation and Reform

Schoolwide Projects

Number of schoolwide projects in Pennsylvania by school year:

1989-90	62
1990-91	92
1991-92	112

According to the State Department of Education, 103 schools were eligible for schoolwide projects in 1990-1991.

The SEA has encouraged the development and implementation of schoolwide projects by: convening a meeting of all school districts who had eligible buildings, sending staff from eligible school districts to other schools with schoolwide projects, and conducting staff development sessions at eligible schoolwide project buildings. Using state administration funds, the SEA provides workshops, on-site visitations, in-depth research studies, and consultants to schools implementing schoolwide projects.

Effective instructional models and techniques (such as cooperative learning, the Johnson City model, Reading Recovery, and Cooperative Integrated Reading and Composition) have been undertaken through schoolwide projects.

The SEA makes the following estimates of the number of schools that would be eligible for schoolwide projects if the low-income eligibility threshold were reduced from 75 percent to the following levels: 223 at 60 percent, 500 at 50 percent, and 600 at 40 percent.

Coordination with the Regular Classroom

Coordination with the regular program (curriculum alignment) has been part of the SEA monitoring program for three years. This emphasis means that each school district in the state has been evaluated on Chapter 1 coordination with the regular program. The SEA is encouraging LEAs to provide Chapter 1 services in the regular classroom through: a monitoring instrument that focuses on curriculum alignment; contracting services with Research and Information Services for Education (RISE), which is the NDN facilitator; through RBS in the area of Effective Practices; and through the TAC, which conducts statewide staff development on in-class models. The SEA also conducts smaller workshops; effective practices workshops have been focused on coordination. The first annual Chapter 1 Early Childhood Conference and the First Annual Chapter 1/Special Education conference were conducted in 1991. Both conferences emphasized coordination of effective instructional programs in support of the basic program of the building.

The SEA is encouraging the option of Chapter 1 early childhood education through regional workshops and an annual state Chapter 1 Early Childhood Conference. Head Start, as well as community based programs, are encouraged to participate in the annual state conference.

Statewide Coordination

The Pennsylvania Department of Education no longer operates a state sponsored compensatory education program. Chapter 1 does serve as a framework for collaboration in the areas of early childhood and special education. Chapter 1 is integrated with Chapter 2 and the Eisenhower program (Title II) and all program improvement efforts consider all three federal programs. The same SEA staff who work with the school districts are responsible for Chapter 1, Chapter 2, and the Eisenhower program, which are all monitored collaboratively. SEA staff encourage district staff for those three programs to look at the three funding sources collectively. In the reallocation process for the programs, the SEA puts a priority on providing Title II and Chapter 2 funds to Chapter 1 program improvement schools.

The SEA has streamlined the administrative requirements at the local level by integrating federal programs in the use of singular process for administration and monitoring. The SEA has provided guidance in the fall with USDE

policy letters to all school districts, by regional meetings, and through the state conferences, which emphasize the coordination of Chapter 1 and special education. The state recommends using the statute and regulations for selecting limited-English-proficient students for Chapter 1 services. Six school districts in Pennsylvania use Chapter 1 funds for bilingual or English-as-a-second-language (ESL) students.

Making a Difference School by School

Schoolwide Project at the William Cramp Elementary School, Philadelphia

The William Cramp Elementary School, an inner-city school located in north Philadelphia, serves 1,002 students in pre-school through 4th grade. Located in a low-income, ethnically mixed neighborhood, the school's population is approximately 74 percent Latino, 17 percent White, 7 percent Black, 1 percent Asian, and 1 percent Native American. Eighty-five percent of the students qualify for free lunch because of low family income. The mobility of the student population presents a special challenge; about one-fourth of the students transfer out each year to be replaced by new students.

The schoolwide project program was planned during the 1987-88 year and implemented from September 1988 through June 1991. Consistent with the schoolwide projects statute, the program is designed to improve the entire educational program of the school, addressing the needs of all of Cramp's students with additional assistance targeted to students especially at risk of failure.

The Cramp schoolwide project design is based upon in-class delivery of services. It combines the best of Effective Schools research with a literature-based/whole-language, student-centered curriculum. The philosophy is that all children can achieve academic success and become thoughtful, considerate citizens if provided a demanding curriculum in a well-structured, nurturing environment.

Supports are directed toward prevention within the regular classroom, with support personnel providing reduced student/teacher ratios for basic reading and math instruction. The literature based/whole-language curriculum, following the Pennsylvania Comprehensive Reading Plan II (PCRP II) and supported by extensive, on-site professional development, propels attainment of both basic and advanced literacy skills. Using trade books, teachers design thematic units that integrate subject areas and build upon students' own life experiences, questions, and hypotheses. Reading and writing for real purposes pervade the school day. One of the most important results is that children at Cramp School love books and see themselves as authors.

Cramp uses a broad spectrum of recognition programs to celebrate every child as capable, valuable, and successful. Children are recognized for achievement and progress in reading, math, and other subject areas, as well as for good behavior and citizenship.

A comprehensive Pupil Support Committee involves teachers and parents in reflective discussions of students experiencing difficulty in school. Alternative instructional strategies are generated, implemented, and monitored. Supplementary service is offered in the form of before- and after-school tutoring, extended-day programs and linkages to community service agencies and special programs that support student success and parental/community involvement.

The outcomes for the William Cramp schoolwide project's educationally deprived students are noteworthy for the following reasons:

- Cramp's Chapter 1 students' scores exceed the Chapter 1 averages for percent correct on the citywide criterion-referenced test in mathematics at all grade levels. The proportion of students reading at or above grade level as measured by reading level tests doubled from 1987 to 1991. In addition, criterion-referenced scores from 1987 through 1991 show a turnaround from pre-program to program years, with consistent growth across all grade levels since the beginning of the schoolwide project program in September of 1988.
- Students achieved three years of positive NCE gains. They demonstrated the maintenance of positive NCE gains during the three program years in both reading and mathematics and a steady increase in the magnitude of the reading gains.

Sustained effects, (at William Cramp Elementary) measured longitudinally, were positive in both reading and mathemathics.

- In 1990-92, total NCE gains exceeded local, state, and national comparison groups in both reading and mathematics. In addition, grade-by-grade comparisons show that the William Cramp gains exceeded national and local comparisons at every grade level in reading and at two out of three levels in mathematics.
- Sustained effects, measured longitudinally, were positive in both reading and mathematics. From June 1989 to June 1991, average NCE scores for the group rose 6.5 NCEs in reading and 5 points in mathematics.
- Despite an increase in poverty (measured by proportion of students from families qualifying for Aid to Families with Dependent Children) from 55.9 percent in 1987 to 68.6 percent in 1991, the percentage of students testing as educationally deprived declined from 80.4 percent in 1987 to 70.2 percent in 1991.

Program Improvement at Porter Township Elementary School, Porter Township

The Porter Township Elementary School conducted a successful program improvement project. The school was initially identified for program improvement based on 1988-89 test scores averaging -.33 NCEs.

The Pennsylvania Department of Education began the process by conducting a program improvement workshop for school faculty and administrators in the fall of 1989. With this general guidance and background, the school undertook the initiative by immediately making several significant modifications to the Chapter 1 program at the school while planning additional interventions that were implemented in the following school term.

The Chapter 1 teacher who worked at the school for one-half day was assigned to the school full-time. This time increase, paid for with regular Chapter 1 funds, had the immediate effect of improving the coordination between the regular classroom teachers and the Chapter 1 teacher. In addition, the Chapter 1 teacher was able to devote more time to the individual needs of the Chapter 1 children. The school Parent-Teacher Organization (PTO) became involved in the program improvement process and suggested that Paired Reading be adopted as a reading technique at the school. Training for parents, faculty, and administrators was undertaken.

The Paired Reading program seemed to have significant impact and resulted in bringing other adults and older students into the program. Paired Reading became so successful that other schools in the district have adopted the program.

A sustained staff development program was undertaken at the school and was paid for with program improvement funds. The most creative and innovative staff development focused on rewriting basal reader questions to orient them toward higher-order thinking skills. The faculty was particularly enthusiastic about this work and believes it to be very effective.

Program improvement funds were also used to pay for substitutes so that the faculty could do initial planning, in-progress evaluation, and staff development. This was particularly important because it provided time for the personnel involved to direct their attention to program improvement.

Test scores show that the program improvement interventions were successful. In 1989-90, the average NCE gain for the school was +10.02 and in 1990-91, +4.26. As a further indicator of success, the school has met its desired outcomes requirements in each of those years as well, which indicates the schools' personnel have been able to develop appropriate learning outcomes and effective assessment of those outcomes.

Puerto Rico

Chapter 1 Participation and Funding Summary

Participation Levels in School Year (SY) 1990-91

Number of Children Served:	268,631
Percentage of K-12 Children Served:	42%
Number and Percentage of School Districts Receiving Chapter 1 Assistance:	1; 100%
Number and Percentage of Schools Receiving Chapter 1 Assistance:	1,375; 86%

Chapter 1 Services by Grade Span in SY 1990-91

Preschool	0%
Kindergarten	3%
Grades 1-3	34%
Grades 4-6	33%
Grades 7-12	30%

State Funding Levels by School Year

Formula Grants Allocation SY 1990-91, 1991-92:	$176,099,991; $221,583,987
Formula Grants Allocation SY 1992-93:	$253,589,901
Chapter 1 Per Pupil Expenditure SY 1990-91:	$583
Program Improvement Allocation SY 1991-92; 1992-93:	$526,599; $916,936

Chapter 1 Program Improvement Summary

Number of Schools in Program Improvement in SY 1991-92

Total Number of Schools in Program Improvement:	184
Percentage of Chapter 1 Schools in Program Improvement:	13%
Number of Schools in Joint Planning:	0

Statewide Minimum Standards for Improvement–Schools should have an aggregate normal curve equivalent (NCE) of 36 percent or less. Since the APRENDA norm-referenced test was used for the first time in April 1991, there is no gain or loss in NCEs. Thus, for the first year, the 36 percentile or less as aggregate NCE is the upper limit. The test was administered for the second time in April 1992. NCE gains may be determined after the test is scored and a new standard may then be used for the coming years.

Chapter 1 Program Improvement

Leveraging Accountability and Higher Performance

The Puerto Rico Department of Education (PRDE) places a high degree of emphasis on the role of Chapter 1 program improvement in holding schools accountable for improving student performance. Because of the high numbers of educationally disadvantaged students in the school system, Chapter 1 plays an important role in most students' educational careers. Chapter 1 greatly influences daily instructional practice, as well as overall student performance.

In April of 1991, the state education agency (SEA) used the newly developed Puerto Rico APRENDA test to identify Chapter 1 students for the first time. Before this test was developed, an aggregate NCE was used to identify schools for program improvement. A performance standard in terms of NCE gains will be established in coordination with the Committee of Practitioners.

The Puerto Rico Department of Education encourages every school to use achievement results and other desired outcomes to determine student needs and school participation. During the 1989-90 school year, there were 980 schools identified for program improvement, compared with 184 schools currently in program improvement. The change in number of identified schools is due in large part to the use of the APRENDA test, which is considered to be a much better gauge of student performance.

Statewide Technical Assistance

The SEA and its adminsitrative school districts have worked with individual schools identified for program improvement to develop desired outcomes according to their needs. SEA Chapter 1 offices and the Technical Assistance Centers (TACs) hold orientations for staff members of recently identifed schools.

The SEA has also contracted with specialists in the field to provide technical assistance to the 98 schools identified as most in need. Two education programs are employed: practical strategies for school improvement and managment systems for teachers. In-service training is provided by Chapter 1 staff and the Region B Rural Technical Assistance Center (RTAC). The Region A RTAC assists PRDE in Chapter 1 evaluation, testing needs, and the development of Chapter 1 policies to meet program requirements.

The Chapter 1 Technical Assistance Unit of the regular program of the PRDE has focused on the development of advanced skills, first, by identifying basic and advanced skills by grades, and second, by offering in-service training to

Chapter 1 teachers. A number of successful projects, including the Instrumental Enrichment and Reciprical Teaching projects, have been adopted for replication.

Supervisors from regional, district, and central offices conduct follow-up visits to schools to assist them with the implementation of their plans. They coordinate and offer recommendations on curriculum and instructional strategies.

The SEA coordinates monitoring and compliance requirements through on-site visits to schools when assisting with the implementation of improvement plans.

Funding for Program Improvement

Approximately 75 percent of the administrative time of the Technical Assistance Unit of the regular program of the SEA is devoted to the responsibilities for Chapter 1 program improvement. This unit provides orientation in technical and programmatic issues, training of school personnel, and coordination of in-service training contracted services. The unit also assists the PRDE Planning and Education Development Secretariat in training school personnel, which includes training teachers on APRENDA test interpretation.

Increasing Capacity for School Improvement

The National School Services Corporation provides technical assistance with implementing program improvement plans under contract with the PRDE. The current resources are insufficient to provide systematic, islandwide assistance at all regional, local, and central levels. Given the magnitude of the task, additional fiscal support and personnel are necessary to undertake comprehensive technical assistance and training to the seven educational regions, which in turn, are charged with providing in-service training for school districts.

Additional Chapter 1 Innovation and Reform

Schoolwide Projects

Number of schoolwide projects in Puerto Rico by school year.

1989-90	0
1990-91	0
1991-92	9

According to a PRDE survey, 1,375 Chapter 1 schools were eligible for schoolwide projects in 1990-91.

It is important to note that due to the fact that practically all schools qualify for schoolwide projects, the PRDE began this program as a pilot project with eight schools, one of which separated into two distinct schools after the project began, so a total of nine schools participated. The SEA sought to obtain expertise from the nine schools involved in schoolwide projects before initiating the program on a wider scale.

Given the magnitude of the task, additional fiscal support and personnel are necessary to undertake comprehensive technical assistance and training to the seven educational regions.

In the 1992-93 school year, 184 schools expressed interest in implementing schoolwide projects. Of these, 41 were selected to participate. It is estimated that 100 additional schools will implement schoolwide projects in the following year as part of an ongoing effort by the PRDE to expand the program.

To initiate a schoolwide project, the school staff must spend a year of training to evaluate available strategies, parental involvement, staff development, and teacher training. Orientations, in-service training, and follow-up visits are provided by the SEA and its contractors. Contractor services also include training veteran school and district staff to train personnel from new schools entering the program.

Instructional strategies have been revised and individualized education models have been adopted. The reorganization strategies include extended-day and summer programs, computer-assisted instruction, and grouping by levels.

The SEA estimates that if the low-income eligibility threshold were reduced from 75 to 60 percent, all of Puerto Rico's public schools will be eligible for schoolwide projects.

Statewide Coordination

In August of 1990, Puerto Rico approved a new law for educational reform. This law, known as Ley Organica del Departamento de Educacion, provides for a statewide school improvement effort and systemwide reform and complies with Chapter 1 program requirements.

The limited-English-proficient (LEP) students are selected for Chapter 1 services on the basis of the results of the Puerto Rico APRENDA test. In the 1991-92 school year, 231,485 students were identified as LEP students.

Making a Difference School by School

Schoolwide Project at Juan Ponce de Leon, Guaynabo, San Juan

Juan Ponce de Leon School was one of the eight schools identified to participate in the PRDE pilot schoolwide project program in the 1991-92 school year. All curriculum and service components of the new school are targeted to achieve the following goals identified for improvement: an increase in student achievement in all subject matters; better development of basic, advanced, and

thinking skills; a reduction in illiteracy and student drop-out rates; use of technolgy to strengthen curriculum; better coordination and communication between members of the school improvement committee and the rest of the staff; a complete restructuring of the school; enhancement of teacher training; and the creation of a peaceful school environment.

Training for parents and staff helps the school achieve its mission. Activities include monthly workshops; weekly meetings; a collaboration project with the University of Puerto Rico (UPR) in which personnel will participate in courses, workshops, and so on, access to the UPR library; teachers working in teams; team self-evaluation (weekly evaluation of work done); summer preparation of teachers; a study center in the school (education library); and a readers' club for the school's adults.

The schoolwide project will be evaluated as follows: evaluation sheets will be designed incorporating all the schoolwide program's objectives in different areas; student progress; school environment; changes in curriculum and methodology; school restructuring; parent participation; student changes in behavior; and student participation in the different activities and committees.

Monthly evaluation meetings will be held. At the end of each semester, there will also be an evaluation meeting that will include parents and teachers. Questionnaires for parents, teachers, and students during and after each semester will be administered, and individual interviews with students identified as possible drop-outs will be conducted.

The PRDE expects to use the Other School Comparison (OSC) model for NCE comparison at the end of the three-year schoolwide project period.

Rhode Island

Chapter 1 Participation and Funding Summary

Participation Levels in School Year (SY) 1990-91

Number of Children Served:	15,361
Percentage of K-12 Children Served:	10%
Number and Percentage of School Districts Receiving Chapter 1 Assistance:	37; 100%
Number and Percentage of Schools Receiving Chapter 1 Assistance:	154; 77%

Chapter 1 Services by Grade Span in SY 1990-91

Preschool	<1%
Kindergarten	3%
Grades 1-3	35%
Grades 4-6	29%
Grades 7-12	32%

State Funding Levels by School Year

Formula Grants Allocation SY 1990-91, 1991-92:	$18,091,544; $21,112,145
Formula Grants Allocation SY 1992-93:	$23,462,738
Chapter 1 Per Pupil Expenditure SY 1990-91:	$1,100
Program Improvement Allocation SY 1991-92; 1992-93:	$90,000; $180,000

Chapter 1 Program Improvement Summary

Number of Schools in Program Improvement in SY 1991-92

Total Number of Schools in Program Improvement:	73
Percentage of Chapter 1 Schools in Program Improvement:	47%
Number of Schools in Joint Planning:	3

Statewide Minimum Standards for Improvement–A normal curve equivalent (NCE) gain of greater than one for grades 2-12 with at least 55 percent of the participants in a school in grades 2-12 achieving at least one NCE gain: and substantial progress in achieving a desired outcome not based on a norm referenced test for grades below 2.

Chapter 1 Program Improvement

Leveraging Accountability and Higher Performance

A broad school improvement initiative is evolving for Rhode Island's public education system. The 21st Century Education Commission was established by the governor to review each major element of public education. The commission's report highlights the need for significant changes in school governance, education finance, development and implementation of effective classroom practices, and measurement of student achievement and performance. The report will serve as the framework for reform in Rhode Island schools. These reforms are illustrative of the Chapter 1 school improvement initiatives under way for the last few years and provide the higher performance and accountability leverage necessary for the success of all children.

Statewide Technical Assistance

The state education agency (SEA) encourages and assists school districts with establishing responsive and locally relevant desired outcomes through statewide administrative workshops; statewide and individual program improvement workshops for district coordinators; and school staff members; and parent training sessions on Chapter 1 accountability provisions.

Once schools are identified for program improvement, the SEA has provided assistance to them in a number of ways, including data analysis and the use of self-assessment forms that draw from best practices for reading, language arts, and mathematics. The SEA emphasizes the development of advanced skills and the adoption of successful models for compensatory education participants at the annual conference for teachers of Chapter 1 students. In-class programs, summer school programs, schoolwide projects, extended-day programs, and effective parental involvement activities are shared formally and informally with all project directors during on-site and telephone technical assistance sessions.

To combat the infrequent negative association at the local level, the SEA has taken care to encourage the idea that the program improvement process is an opportunity and not a punishment. It has presented this view to superintendents, local directors, teachers, parents, contracted evaluators, and other practitioners in a variety of arenas.

Successful Models

Rhode Island's Chapter 1 program improvement schools have employed a number of instructional strategies and curriculum models. Many schools are piloting in-class programs, providing additional resources for frequent and ongoing coordination with the regular program, and providing workshops and seminars for advanced skills strategies.

Over the past year, there has been a fifty percent increase in the number of districts conducting summer programs, which are designed to offer a more concentrated time span for reading and writing activities.

Exiting Program Improvement

During the 1989-90 testing cycle, sixty-nine schools were identified for program improvement. Of those schools, twenty-eight tested out before their plans were fully implemented. The SEA believes these schools tested out in part because of aberrations in test scores but also because many schools made instructional changes in the project before the plans were implemented the following year. The process of self-assessment and review of promising practices, coupled with staff development, was powerful in several schools.

However, the SEA Chapter 1 office still strongly encourages schools to fully implement their plan by coordinating implementation with the regular program activities even when they test out of program improvement . When SEA encouragement is not sufficient, the SEA offers program improvement funds to these schools, if funds are available, after allocation among those schools that do not test out.

Joint SEA/LEA Plans

Borrowing from the Indiana SEA, the SEA Chapter 1 staff and the evaluation unit staff review an original plan done by the identified schools. They rate the plan as poor, needs improvement, or outstanding. As the SEA staff monitors the progress of plan implementation, they are prepared to let pass the outstanding ones with little if any modification by the SEA. Those viewed as needing improvement warrant a meeting with the school staff to continue exploring and sharing good practices under way in other district schools. Those viewed as poor are visited by the technical assistance team (Chapter 1, literacy, and evaluation staff). The SEA assists many of these schools tailoring the LEA project to desired outcomes. Additional funds are targeted for joint program improvement schools and the district coordinators are so advised.

Funding for Program Improvement

To date, 90 percent of the 1990-91 program improvement funds have been distributed. Districts are often slow to request funds because of the timing of the program improvement identification process for fall to fall projects and in some cases, spring to spring projects.

The SEA has awarded 90 percent of the program improvement funds as mini-grants to LEAs. Because funds are awarded on the merits of need and scope of improvement plans, the Chapter 1 office requires districts to complete program improvement plans before program improvement funds are requested. In addition to the targeted funding for program improvement, the SEA Chapter 1 staff devote approximately 50 percent of their time for program improvement responsibilities, all of which was supported by state administrative funds in the 1991-92 school year.

Increasing Capacity for School Improvement

Because Rhode Island is a small state receiving the small state minimum administrative allocation, there is a great demand on the SEA to create systems and programs that will prevent program improvement schools from failing to meet minimum standards. Additional staff is needed to devote time exclusively to schools identified for program improvement. The SEA requires more resources to manage and collect data in a timely manner, as well as to help schools and school districts implement a data base to manage local information.

Additional Chapter 1 Innovation and Reform

Schoolwide Projects

Number of schoolwide projects in Rhode Island by school year:

1989-90	0
1990-91	1
1991-92	3

Approximately six more schools are expected to become eligible for schoolwide projects and participate in the 1992-93 school year. In these school districts, the SEA staff met with the superintendent, project director, and school principal to review the elements critical to the success of schoolwide projects, and to suggest conducting a school needs assessment. In every contact, the SEA emphasizes that great care must be given to both improving the educational performance of deprived students and upgrading the entire school program.

The SEA emphasizes best practices, Effective Schools research, staff development and training, and the creation of parent centers.

Staff development is a major element in all three schoolwide projects. One project particularly emphasizes school-based management. Other instructional changes include setting aside longer blocks of time for the reading/writing curriculum and reducing the number of pullouts by conducting in-class programs and after-school tutorials and enrichment projects. The SEA has not mandated additional criteria for approval of schoolwide project applications, but strongly encourages interested schools to visit the present schoolwide project staff and classrooms. The SEA advises districts that it does not look favorably upon projects that wish to reduce classroom size and continue with the traditional Chapter 1 program. Instead, the SEA emphasizes best practices,

Effective Schools research, staff development and training, and the creation of parent centers.

The SEA makes the following estimates of the number of schools that would be eligible for schoolwide projects if the low-income eligibility were reduced from 75 percent to the following levels: 24 schools at 60 percent; 31 schools at 50 percent, and 39 schools at 40 percent.

Statewide Coordination

At the present time, Chapter 1 serves as a framework for individual school improvement. The 21st Century Commission initiative will become the framework for districtwide and statewide school improvement. Student outcomes for all children will be developed. Six schools will be established as demonstration schools wherein innovative instructional methods will be piloted for students at risk of failure. Continuous staff development and support will be established for teachers and administrators at the state and local level. Professional practice schools where teachers and administrators can learn new instructional strategies through observation, classroom training, mentoring, and peer coaching will be designated. Finally, an accountability process will be developed to target schools that fail to meet statewide achievement benchmarks. Chapter 1 programs will be subject to these statewide initiatives. Coordination and collaboration at the state and local level will be ongoing.

The state's two compensatory education programs are coordinated with the Chapter 1 program. The Rhode Island Literacy and Dropout Prevention Program and the State Program for the Disadvantaged are described in the Chapter 1 Three-Year Application and review by the Chapter 1 staff. The Consolidated Three-Year Application was developed by the state staff to streamline paperwork and to increase coordination at the local and state levels. To better coordinate early childhood programs, the Literacy Division's early childhood specialist is the state Even Start contact and has built a strong rapport with the Head Start directors and Chapter 1 local coordinators. The SEA has encouraged the use of Chapter 1 funds for preschool projects by showcasing them at state workshops for district directors, early childhood specialists, reading teachers, and parents.

The SEA closely follows the federal policy regulations for coordinating programs for Chapter 1 participants who are enrolled in special education and limited-English-proficient classes.

Making a Difference School by School

Program Improvement at the Tiverton Middle School, Tiverton

The Tiverton Middle School reading program was targeted for program improvement based on its failure to meet the aggregate standard of one NCE in basic and advanced skills. The classroom staff and reading specialists completed the Chapter 1 self-assessment survey and reported three areas of concern: collaborative curriculum planning, staff development, and coordination between Chapter 1 and classroom staff. In an attempt to resolve these issues, discussions were held among the Chapter 1 Director, the Superintendent of Schools, the school principal, Chapter 1 teachers, and classroom teachers. A plan to provide in-service training on coordination and collaborative curriculum planning was created.

In-class Chapter 1 models have been encouraged by the district Chapter 1 director, but these models have been limited in scope. Recently, Chapter 1 district funds have been targeted for participation at state and regional conferences by the Tiverton Middle School staff. Based on this exposure, several Chapter 1 and classroom teachers are now ready to explore in class models. One Chapter 1 teacher and one classroom teacher have successfully combined in-class and pull-out models this year. These individuals will conduct an in-service program outlining their successes along with pitfalls to avoid when conducting Chapter 1 programs in the students' regular classrooms. They will also discuss how the in-class program has enhanced their professional relationships as co-teachers and co-planners. In-service will be conducted during this 1992-93 school year to aid those staff members implementing in-class programs. Assistance will also be ongoing and supportive of coordination efforts between the Chapter 1 program and the regular classroom program.

South Carolina

Chapter 1 Participation and Funding Summary

Participation Levels in School Year (SY) 1990-91

Number of Children Served:	69,472
Percentage of K-12 Children Served:	11%
Number and Percentage of School Districts Receiving Chapter 1 Assistance:	91; 100%
Number and Percentage of Schools Receiving Chapter 1 Assistance:	540; 54%

Chapter 1 Services by Grade Span in SY 1990-91

Preschool	2%
Kindergarten	4%
Grades 1-3	40%
Grades 4-6	33%
Grades 7-12	21%

State Funding Levels by School Year

Formula Grants Allocation SY 1990-91, 1991-92:	$74,310,903; $86,855,308
Formula Grants Allocation SY 1992-93:	$95,775,507
Chapter 1 Per Pupil Expenditure SY 1990-91:	$1,070
Program Improvement Allocation SY 1991-92; 1992-93:	$205,924; $344,974

Chapter 1 Program Improvement Summary

Number of Schools in Program Improvement in SY 1991-92

Total Number of Schools in Program Improvement:	121
Percentage of Chapter 1 Schools in Program Improvement:	22%
Number of Schools in Joint Planning:	37

Statewide Minimum Standards for Improvement–One normal curve equivalent (NCE) gain for aggregate achievement in basic and advanced skills and substantial progress in achieving two other desired outcomes to be established by the district, one for basic skills and the other for more advanced skills.

Chapter 1 Program Improvement

Leveraging Accountability and Higher Performance

Program improvement is not new to the state. South Carolina required districts to undergo program improvement several years before it became federally mandated. Identification for this process was based on failure to make the required one NCE gain on aggregate data. Therefore, local education agencies (LEAs) have been receptive to the current regulation and overall do not associate negative feelings with program improvement. Another part of the reason that schools are not uncomfortable with program improvement is the state education agencies (SEA's) movement to a cooperative arrangement rather than a mandated restructuring.

The SEA has seen schools begin to concentrate more on the early childhood years, thereby offering prevention rather than remediation in later years. This early childhood emphasis is also a major thrust of the State Department of Education. Along with extended-day early childhood programs and Reading Recovery (tutor model) for 1st graders, whole language is becoming an integral part of reading instruction while the use of manipulatives is more prevalent in math.

Assistance in establishing desired outcomes has been provided to LEAs through workshops, the technical assistance center (TAC), rural technical assistance centers (RTACs), direct involvement with the LEAs, and the SEA's review of outcomes. The Committee of Practitioners does not support the establishment of a higher statewide standard.

The program improvement identification process is considered fairly accurate. However, the SEA has concerns that the data analysis as aggregated by the LEA may be improperly done. The SEA is hoping to overcome this problem, possibly by providing LEAs with the technological means to analyze data more accurately.

Statewide Technical Assistance

Currently, the SEA is offering Effective Schools training and extensive on-site technical assistance to schools in joint program improvement. Further, all program improvement schools eligible to become schoolwide projects are being encouraged to restructure as schoolwide sites with assistance provided by the SEA.

Many workshops through the Department and the TAC/RTACs are being held on the development of advanced skills. The adoption of successful models in this area is being promoted by the state's National Diffusion Network facilitator.

The SEA ties Chapter 1 monitoring directly to program improvement goals. The implementation of program improvement is closely reviewed during on-site visits. This linkage also provides feedback as to where additional assistance may be needed and what kind of assistance it should be.

Exiting Program Improvement

Of the schools identified for program improvement based on the 1989-90 testing cycle, six (5%) tested out prior to full implementation of their plans. Overall, the SEA is seeing many schools that test out and are therefore no longer required to implement their program improvement plans; however, the SEA has found that the schools testing out usually want to continue implementation of their program improvement plans.

Joint SEA/LEA Plans

It is requested that schools requiring joint involvement submit a second year plan to the SEA. The plan is reviewed and a state-funded technical assistance team works with the faculty to help them identify their needs and to assist them in revising the plan so that it addresses the identified needs. Chapter 1-funded schoolwide consultants are also available to assist those schools that are in joint program improvement and are also eligible to become schoolwide projects. In this first year of joint plans in the state, the SEA is awaiting results from these efforts.

Funding for Program Improvement

All of the program improvement funds for 1990-91 have been distributed on a per-pupil basis to the schools identified for program improvement. Additionally, at least 40 percent of state administration staff time is spent on Chapter 1 program improvement. As a result of increased attention to program improvement, many administrative activities have been reduced. A few of these are comparability, project amendment review, dissemination of information to LEAs, workshops, and record gathering on LEA program operations and targeting. Monitoring has also been greatly reduced. Because monitoring is now performed by other staff persons, some Chapter 1 staff time has been freed, which can now be devoted to program improvement. Basically, though, the time necessary to meet the program improvement requirement goes beyond the normal day.

Increasing Capacity for School Improvement

Current resources at the SEA are vastly inadequate to meet the demands of program improvement. Resources should be available to help districts compile and analyze data to assess their program improvement status. This assessment needs to be done accurately so that the schools identified are those truly most in need of assistance. The data also need to be generated in a timely manner. Additionally, Chapter 1 resources must become available to support the teams required for on-site assistance, workshops, and plan development rather than relying on state-funded individuals who have many equally demanding responsibilities. Although a state hiring freeze is in effect at present, Chapter 1 funding is the real obstacle to employing needed staff.

Additional Chapter 1 Innovation and Reform

Schoolwide Projects

Number of schoolwide projects in South Carolina by school year:

1989-90:	1
1990-91:	7
1991-92:	34

According to SEA records, 192 schools in the state were eligible for schoolwide projects in the 1990-91 school year.

The SEA is putting forth a major effort to encourage all eligible schools to take advantage of the opportunity. The schoolwide concept is almost always discussed when any SEA staff person is in contact with an LEA representative. Also, a schoolwide project conference will be held by the SEA. Further, staff persons have been recently hired to promote schoolwide projects throughout the state and to help these schools with assessing their needs, team building, restructuring, and plan development.

In the current operational schoolwide projects, changes have included undertakings such as Success for All; Reading Recovery; extended pre-kindergarten and kindergarten programs; extended-day, after-school programs; whole language; computer-assisted instruction; and reduced class size. Each school is required to submit a plan to the SEA detailing the thrust of their schoolwide activity.

To date, the maintenance of effort requirement for schools with schoolwide projects has not been a problem. With potential state funding cuts coming in the near future, it is likely that demonstration of maintenance of effort will become difficult.

Based on SEA records, the following number of schools would be eligible for schoolwide projects if the low-income eligibility threshold were lowered from 75 percent to the following levels: 307 schools at 60 percent, 404 schools at 50 percent, and 547 schools at 40 percent.

Coordination with the Regular Classroom

The SEA encourages LEAs to provide Chapter 1 services in the regular classroom by promoting early childhood programs, schoolwide projects, and inclusive education. Further, the State Board policy places emphasis on coordination with the regular classroom regardless of the approach. LEAs are given assistance in meeting this mandate through workshops that present effective means of coordination. Also, on-site visits include a close view of all coordination efforts to ensure that they are appropriate.

Coordination with the regular classroom is also strengthened when schools use computer labs. Regular classroom teachers are becoming more involved in their students' computer lab instruction through printouts to the classroom

along with workshops on interpretation and use of printouts.

Statewide Coordination

Coordination not only exists at the LEA level but also at the state level. Chapter 1 is closely coordinated with the state compensatory education program, which is modeled after Chapter 1 and allows for close coordination of program goals and monitoring requirements. Program improvement for the state compensatory program is based on the same NCE gain requirement established for Chapter 1. Also, if a school is identified for program improvement for both Chapter 1 and state compensatory education, the Chapter 1 plan for improvement serves both programs. Further, any state technical assistance for schools identified as being in need includes the consideration of Chapter 1 schools identified for program improvement.

The use of Chapter 1 funds for preschool and early primary years is a major thrust now at the SEA. Many workshops and meetings are being held to promote this concentration on the early years. Also, some statewide efforts have begun to coordinate the Chapter 1 program with Head Start with Head Start providing most of the services to migrant students

Although the areas of state compensatory education, special education, and bilingual education have always been addressed in the SEA's Chapter 1 Administration Manual, the move is now to actively tie these programs more closely to Chapter 1. Another thrust of the SEA is to streamline paperwork requirements at the LEA level. The South Carolina Department of Education is initiating a review process for this purpose.

Services are offered to limited-English-proficient (LEP) students by Chapter 1 provided that the student has needs resulting from educational deprivation. These children are selected for service on the same basis as other children identified as eligible for Chapter 1. Currently, 141 students statewide in reading and math are receiving Chapter 1 and LEP services.

The education model that South Carolina is moving toward will coordinate Chapter 1 and special education. At this time, Chapter 1 offers services to the special education students whose instructional needs result from educational deprivation. Chapter 1 is working closely with special education to look at inclusive education models, particularly in schoolwide projects.

The SEA ties Chapter 1 monitoring directly to program improvement goals.

Making a Difference School by School

Schoolwide Project and Program Improvement at Wilmot J. Fraser Elementary School, Charleston

Fraser Elementary has undertaken comprehensive restructuring as a schoolwide project while dealing with reform issues as a school identified for Chapter 1 program improvement. Fraser is a city school that serves 699 K-5 students. The population is 95 percent low-income.

The school focuses on providing developmentally appropriate learning experiences by offering full-day kindergarten for all students. Activities include the use of Peabody Language Development Kits and the Story Telling and Retelling (START) program in which students retell stories read to them by their teachers. Explorations, a math manipulative program, is used to teach early mathematical concepts.

Fraser has just entered its second year of program improvement in reading. In year two, the school failed to meet its other desired outcome in reading. Over the past two years, Fraser has received intensive staff development and on-site technical assistance from the Johns Hopkins' Success for All program. Currently, the school provides students in the primary grades with 90 minutes of reading instruction daily in small groups of 15-17 students. During reading instruction, students in grades 1-3 are grouped according to reading level regardless of grade level. Additionally, all students receive ten to twelve minutes of computer-assisted instruction daily.

During regular instruction, the 1st grade students often work in pairs. In 2nd and 3rd grade, the basal instruction is supplemented by direct teaching of comprehension lessons developed by Johns Hopkins. In grades 4 and 5, students work in small, mixed-ability teams using the district-adopted basal series, which is coordinated with the Johns Hopkins Cooperative-Integrated Reading and Composition program.

Reading tutors work with students who are experiencing difficulty in their reading groups on an individual basis for twenty minutes daily providing reteaching and reinforcement.

In grades 1 through 3, student performance is assessed every 9 weeks to determine if students need to be reassigned to a higher or lower reading group.

All students receive eighty minutes of math instruction daily from their regular classroom teacher. A specially trained math teacher provides an additional 40 minutes of math instruction to the students in grades 2-5 who are most in need of assistance. Further, all students receive ten to twelve minutes of math computer-assisted instruction daily.

Fraser also promotes parental involvement. During individual and group meetings, parents are provided with an explanation of the skills their children need to learn. At this time, appropriate materials (books, games, activities, and so on) are given to the parents, who are then shown how to use the materials.

Approximately two weeks after the parent meeting, a community contact worker does a follow-up home visit to assist the parent and exchange materials. During this visit, the community contact worker models effective teaching practices for the parent. All of these activities are coordinated by a program facilitator who observes in the classroom, plans teacher training, and offers parenting programs.

Due to the concentrated efforts resulting from program improvement and schoolwide use of funds, Fraser Elementary has met the program improvement aggregate achievement requirement in both reading and math. With continued efforts, they should meet the other desired outcome criteria, and no longer require program improvement.

South Dakota

Chapter 1 Participation and Funding Summary

Participation Levels in School Year (SY) 1990-91

Number of Children Served:	13,498
Percentage of K-12 Children Served:	10%
Number and Percentage of School Districts Receiving Chapter 1 Assistance:	178; 99%
Number and Percentage of Schools Receiving Chapter 1 Assistance:	432; 48%

Chapter 1 Services by Grade Span in SY 1990-91

Preschool	1%
Kindergarten	7%
Grades 1-3	45%
Grades 4-6	33%
Grades 7-12	14%

State Funding Levels by School Year

Formula Grants Allocation SY 1990-91, 1991-92:	$14,571,984; $17,041,941
Formula Grants Allocation SY 1992-93:	$18,878,904
Chapter 1 Per Pupil Expenditure SY 1990-91:	$1,080
Program Improvement Allocation SY 1991-92, 1992-93:	$90,000; $180,000

Chapter 1 Program Improvement Summary

Number of Schools in Program Improvement in SY 1991-92

Total Number of Schools in Program Improvement:	66
Percentage of Chapter 1 Schools in Program Improvement:	15%
Number of Schools in Joint Planning:	2

Statewide Minimum Standards for Improvement–A normal curve equivalent (NCE) gain of .5 percent in basic and advanced skills and substantial progress in achieving desired outcomes if chosen by the school district.

Chapter 1 Program Improvement

Leveraging Accountability and Higher Performance

The South Dakota State Department of Education and Cultural Affairs was originally skeptical of the Chapter 1 program improvement concept but is now excited about it. While the state education agency (SEA) wishes that it could use a more reliable measure than NCE gains to measure performance, the SEA is particularly supportive of the student improvement provisions that require districts to address the performance of individual students as well as the aggregate performance of all students within a program. If the district does not have a system in place for looking at individual performance, the SEA assists the district in developing one.

There is a considerable degree of interest in the use of multiple criteria to determine the success of a program. Before the program improvement efforts began, the SEA encouraged all local education agencies (LEAs) to reflect high expectations for their programs when setting goals and objectives.

Although the Committee of Practitioners (COP) has recommended raising the minimum standard to one NCE in reading and math for FY 93, they have been cautious in encouraging higher statewide standards in terms of NCE gains. The COP had felt some frustration with determining program improvement simply on the basis of achievement test results.

Statewide Technical Assistance

SEA technical assistance provided to schools identified for program improvement includes: on-site program improvement workshops, on-site technical assistance during program compliance reviews, on-site visits during the implementation year, on-site team reviews during the joint planning year, increased verbal and written communication or curricular ideas, and model program adoption/adaption. The SEA also assists LEAs in identifying appropriate resource persons to conduct training in using advanced skills.

To reduce the potential negative association at the local level accompanying the identification of schools for program improvement, the SEA has held program improvement workshops, involved the COP, increased awareness, and ensured the effective use of program improvement funds. The identification itself does not point fingers at any one staff person. A Chapter 1 program is an integral part, often a small part, of the entire educational program of a school. To limit program improvement efforts to the Chapter 1 staff or program would be to do a disservice to the students. Most program improvement planning and development has been left to the LEA, unless they have requested some form of technical assistance.

Implementation of National Diffusion Network (NDN) projects such as

Higher Order Thinking Skills (HOTS), emphasis on learning styles, and increased coordination have been evident in visits to program improvement schools.

Exiting Program Improvement

Thirty-two schools identified for Chapter 1 program improvement based on the 1989-90 testing cycle exited the program before full implementation of a school improvement plan. This number represents 46 percent of the total number identified for program improvement in the 1989-90 testing cycle. The SEA feels that in most cases, this testing out is a direct result of the program improvement process. Many program leaders realized that changes were needed and that those changes would not necessarily be painful.

As LEAs are notified that they have tested out of program improvement, they are encouraged to implement any or all aspects of their plan, evaluate and modify their program on an annual basis, and provide staff development opportunities for Chapter 1 personnel.

Joint SEA/LEA Plans

Two schools are currently in the joint planning stage of program improvement. The SEA, along with TAC staff, has conducted on-site team reviews of the programs. These reviews have included interviews with administrators, Chapter 1 directors, Chapter 1 staff, regular classroom staff, Chapter 1 students, and parents of participants. The interviews focused on how the Chapter 1 program reflected the ten attributes of effective schools. A written summary of impressions relating to each attribute was shared with district personnel at the end of the process. At this time, joint plans have not been formally prepared. However, the written summary has provided a starting point for formal plan development.

Joint plan assistance has been supported by state administrative funds. Although no additional funds have been targeted for these schools, the option of doing so exists. In both joint planning schools in South Dakota, planning is still continuing. It is too early to determine results, except that the planning has increased awareness of the role Chapter 1 plays in the overall educational program.

Funding for Program Improvement

Ninety-seven percent of 1990-91 program improvement funds have been distributed to date. The expenditure of program improvement funds has not been affected by any factors at the state level. All program improvement money is provided to LEAs through mini-grants.

At the present time, approximately 10 percent of total state administration staff time is devoted to responsibilities for Chapter 1 program improvement. All of the state technical assistance in program improvement is supported by state administrative funds.

For at least one member of the SEA staff, the time spent on school compliance monitoring has been reduced to allow more time for technical assistance in program improvement. The SEA coordinates the monitoring and compliance requirements through ongoing communication with schools. Review of program improvement plans is conducted with compliance issues in mind.

Currently, the SEA is collaborating with the South Dakota State Modernization Project, the National Science Foundation Project and the Effective Schools Project. The SEA is using the TAC to provide limited technical assistance in the areas of outcome goals and data management.

The SEA has been hampered in its efforts to provide program improvement assistance due to a lack of staff time and expertise in these areas. Efforts have also been hampered by inadequate funding.

Increasing Capacity for School Improvement

The SEA would enhance its program improvement capabilities if a sufficient number of qualified staff members were available. This addition would include dedicating full-time efforts by staff toward meeting LEA program improvement needs. Specifically, the SEA would get more involved in developing local plans, providing in-service, and providing leadership in curriculum development of Chapter 1 programs. Additional resources would enable the SEA to continue providing mini-grants and fund innovative projects that address basic and advanced skills.

Additional Chapter 1 Innovation and Reform

Schoolwide Projects

Number of schoolwide Projects in South Dakota by school year:

1989-90	5
1990-91	12
1991-92	12

According to the SEA, thirty schools in the state were eligible for Chapter 1 schoolwide projects in the 1990-91 school year.

The SEA has held two workshops for eligible schools. In addition, the SEA has made each qualified school aware of national schoolwide meetings.

The SEA is providing information about other states' schoolwide projects and using TAC personnel to conduct a workshop on-site for a district planning schoolwide projects.

Schools with schoolwide projects have developed the following innovations: transitional rooms for 1st grade students to increase their readiness for a formal education program, computer labs for all children, after-school projects for all children, home-school coordinators to improve attendance and parental attitudes, additional staffing to improve the concentration of effort in the reading and math areas, and counselors to provide group guidance activities.

Currently, all schools in schoolwide projects have been able to sustain maintenance of effort.

Data currently available indicate that 30 percent of schoolwide projects will have problems meeting performance improvement requirements.

The SEA makes the following esti-

mates of the number of schools that would be eligible for schoolwide projects if the low-income eligibility threshold were reduced from 75 percent to the following levels: 31 schools at 60 percent, 69 schools at 50 percent, and 150 schools at 40 percent.

Coordination with the Regular Classroom

The SEA has developed add-on and replacement models for use at the middle, junior, and senior high school levels. In addition, the SEA will be providing a sourcebook, as well as in-service training on in-class models at the elementary level. The SEA application and program reviews require each LEA to describe its coordination activities and provide documentation that the coordination plan is being implemented.

Statewide Coordination

In South Dakota, currently there are two state-funded improvement programs. They include Effective Schools and modernization programs. Chapter 1 staff at the SEA level has been involved in these efforts on a limited basis. Although there is some coordination between state-funded program improvement initiatives and Chapter 1 program improvement, it is apparent that each functions independently. A limited amount of Chapter 2 and other funds are used to improve Chapter 1 programs.

South Dakota is doing the following to reduce paperwork requirements for Chapter 1: requiring LEAs to use a consolidated application process; requiring LEAs to maintain only those records that are required by law or regulation; and improving inventory procedures to reduce the amount of recordkeeping needed to maintain an updated inventory of equipment purchases.

Currently, Chapter 1 programs are working with South Dakota's Head Start Collaboration project. The project will focus on transition activities from Head Start to public school programs, including Chapter 1. Head Start and Chapter 1 are combining resources to provide preschool services in one district. Chapter 1 workshops and newsletters have emphasized the importance of preschool programs. During the past year the number of Chapter 1 preschool programs has risen from two to twelve. Planning suggests additional preschool programs will be offered next year.

Chapter 1 guidance states that limited-English-proficient (LEP) children may be served in Chapter 1 if, in the absence of a language problem, a student would be educationally deprived. South Dakota has few non-English-speaking children and only minor problems in this area.

South Dakota does not limit the participation of LEP children if the students can be identified for the services on the same basis as other children. The state does require that these students receive all other services required by law.

To limit program improvement efforts to the Chapter 1 staff or program would be to do a disservice to the students.

Making a Difference School by School

Program Improvement in the Lyman School District

One LEA, identified as having a decrease in student achievement during FY 89, determined the following areas to be in need of improvement: curriculum and program design, parent and community involvement, program development, and staff leadership. The 1989-90 school year was spent developing a plan. In addressing each of these areas during the 1990-91 school year, the effects of the changes are encouraging.

In the area of curriculum and program design, the HOTS program was implemented in grades 3-12. The program offers students the opportunity to learn higher-order thinking skills through problem solving. Feedback from classroom teachers indicates a noticeable improvement in classroom discussions. Students also show a willingness to take risks when answering questions; something that rarely occurred before the implementation of the HOTS program.

Parent and community involvement was increased by two projects. The Chapter 1 staff developed preschool reading packets that were distributed to parents by the county nurse. Chapter 1 also sponsored a kite-flying contest that sparked interest among several members of the community. These activities increased Chapter 1 visibility and promoted a positive attitude within the community.

Program and staff leadership has been enhanced in at least three areas. The Chapter 1 staff presented workshops to regular teachers. These workshops dealt with questioning techniques and wait time. HOTS students produced crossword puzzles for classroom teachers to use by writing their own review questions from content area subjects. Classroom teachers visited HOTS classes to see the different questioning style in action.

Though no official test scores have been released, teachers are encouraged by the preliminary evaluation results. They look forward to the continued implementation of this plan.

Tennessee

Chapter 1 Participation and Funding Summary

Participation Levels in School Year (SY) 1990-91

Number of Children Served:	118,393
Percentage of K-12 Children Served:	13%
Number and Percentage of School Districts Receiving Chapter 1 Assistance:	139; 100%
Number and Percentage of Schools Receiving Chapter 1 Assistance:	908; 55%

Chapter 1 Services by Grade Span in SY 1990-91

Preschool	2%
Kindergarten	6%
Grades 1-3	36%
Grades 4-6	34%
Grades 7-12	22%

State Funding Levels by School Year

Formula Grants Allocation SY 1990-91, 1991-92:	$101,478,690; $119,194,285
Formula Grants Allocation SY 1992-93:	$131,587,233
Chapter 1 Per Pupil Expenditure SY 1990-91:	$857
Program Improvement Allocation SY 1991-92, 1992-93:	$280,406; $472,598

Chapter 1 Program Improvement Summary

Number of Schools in Program Improvement in SY 1991-92

Total Number of Schools in Program Improvement:	453
Percentage of Chapter 1 Schools in Program Improvement:	27%
Number of Schools in Joint Planning:	101

Statewide Minimum Standards for Improvement–Two normal curve equivalent (NCE) gains in basic skills, one NCE gain in advanced skills, and other desired outcomes as stated in the local education agency's (LEA's) application.

Chapter 1 Program Improvement

Leveraging Accountability and Higher Performance

The Tennessee State Department of Education believes that with adequate resources to implement change, Chapter 1 program improvement is exactly what is needed to improve results for at-risk students. The state education agency (SEA) believes that Chapter 1 needs to increase standards and expectations for low-income children and give them the best teachers and assistance possible.

Statewide Technical Assistance

The state encourages the use of other desired outcomes at the state and local levels. The field staff suggests measurable outcomes and helps the LEAs plan for achievement gains during workshops, on-site visits, and other technical assistance contacts.

The SEA sponsors a number of regional workshops for identified schools on all aspects of program improvement. The SEA has met with all directors of the Chapter 1 program to describe in detail the implementation of program improvement and provide assistance to individual schools upon request. Materials supplied by the Technical Assistance Center (TAC) and Rural Technical Assistance Center (RTAC) are also helping increase program emphasis on the development of advanced skills and the adoption of successful models.

Many of Tennessee's school districts are using Writing to Read, Jostens Learning Centers, and other computer-assisted programs to assist in the coordination with the regular programs in the classroom.

All monitoring efforts are designed to increase achievement and other desired outcomes, which will enable a school to avoid or exit from program improvement.

Exiting Program Improvement

At workshops and individual meetings with Chapter 1 directors, the SEA strongly encourages schools that test out of program improvement before fully implementing their plans to continue with the program.

Joint SEA/LEA Plans

The SEA Regional Consultants visit each school in joint planning and help to identify the areas in most need of change and development. State administration funds are used to support this assistance. The joint plans thus far have resulted in a more positive attitude about program improvement and closer working relationships with the individual schools.

Funding for Program Improvement

All of the program improvement money in Tennessee is distributed as mini-grants to the LEAs. All of the 1990-91 program improvement funds have been distributed.

The state administration staff is devoting approximately 35 percent of its time to program improvement. All of this time is supported by state administrative funds.

Additional Chapter 1 Innovation and Reform

Schoolwide Projects

Number of schoolwide projects in Tennessee by school year:

1989-90: 98
1990-91: 118
1991-92: 134

There were 124 schools in the state eligible for schoolwide schools in the 1990-91 school year.

The SEA holds workshops and in-service training for the systems eligible for schoolwide projects. During these sessions, school and LEA staff listen to presentations on the most successful schoolwide projects and the positive results that can be achieved by implementing such projects.

Some schools are using funds schoolwide to introduce teacher pairing as a way to coordinate Chapter 1 services. Others have used their funds to invest in computer-assisted programs or to lower the pupil/teacher ratio.

It is expected that the maintenance of effort requirements on schools with schoolwide projects will result in several schools becoming ineligible. This situation is the result of a major reduction in state funds to LEAs, which was prompted by a substantial shortfall in state revenue. To date, no school has become ineligible, but the shortfall will show up in the coming school year.

The SEA estimates that the following number of schools would be eligible for schoolwide projects if the low-income eligibility threshold were lowered from 75 percent to the following levels: 546 schools at 60 percent, and 718 schools at 50 percent.

Coordination with the Regular Classroom

The SEA discourages the pull-out program. During workshops and other contacts with LEAs, the SEA provides information on options other than the pull-out and encourages services to Chapter 1 children in the regular classroom. For example, during annual district conferences, the SEA conducts a number of sessions for teachers designed primarily to introduce them to the latest, most successful instructional programs.

Making a Difference School by School

Program Improvement at Happy Valley Middle School, Elizabethtown

Happy Valley Middle School was identified for program improvement in the 1989-90 school year. After making little or no progress that year, they were visited by the Chapter 1 director, who met with Chapter 1 and other selected school staff. The plan that was developed and implemented for the 1990-91 school year included the following key strategies: new and innovative delivery models, more time on task, improved cooperation among teachers, more planning and conferencing time for Chapter 1 and regular staff, increased parental involvement, and an emphasis on higher-order thinking skills.

A key ingredient to the success of the school, which showed an average gain of 4.6 NCEs during the school year, was the total involvement of the school principal and the entire school staff. The school is no longer in program improvement, but is still working with its plan.

The joint plans thus far have resulted in a more positive attitude about program improvement and closer working relationship with the individual schools.

Statewide Coordination

The state-sponsored At-Risk Program for economically and educationally disadvantaged students is closely coordinated with, and very similar to, the Chapter 1 program. Both programs are operated by the same personnel within the same unit of the SEA. The goals and monitoring requirements are closely coordinated between the two programs, and there is a consolidated LEA application for funds. The educational purposes for which the funds must be used are also very similar in the two programs. The At-Risk Program targets schools with eligibility thresholds from 75 percent to 60 percent.

When LEAs experience problems coordinating Chapter 1 with special education or bilingual education, the SEA provides clarification on how services may be merged.

Many special education students are served by Chapter 1 programs in Tennessee. Because these students are often low-performing and do not score well on achievement tests, program improvement is commonly triggered in these schools.

Texas

Chapter 1 Participation and Funding Summary

Participation Levels in School Year (SY) 1990-91

Number of Children Served:	402,075
Percentage of K-12 Children Served:	12%
Number and Percentage of School Districts Receiving Chapter 1 Assistance:	1,021; 96%

Chapter 1 Services by Grade Span in SY 1990-91

Preschool	4%
Kindergaren	8%
Grades 1-3	43%
Grades 4-6	31%
Grades 7-12	14%

State Funding Levels by School Year

Formula Grants Allocation SY 1990-91, 1991-92:	$307,473,887; $352,572,786
Formula Grants Allocation SY 1992-93:	$388,020,399
Chapter 1 Per Pupil Expenditure SY 1990-91:	$765
Program Improvement Allocation SY 1991-92, 1992-93:	$936,900; $1,542,774

Number of Schools in Program Improvement in SY 1991-92

Total Number of Schools in Program Improvement:	616
Percentage of Chapter 1 Schools in Program Improvement:	10%
Number of Schools in Joint Planning:	66

Statewide Minimum Standards for Improvement -For the 1991-92 school year, a normal curve equivalent (NCE) gain greater than zero in basic and advanced skills and substantial progress toward achievement of locally determined outcomes.

Chapter 1 Program Improvement

Leveraging Accountability and Higher Performance

Chapter 1 program improvement has caused school districts to review the delivery systems used to provide Chapter 1 services, and in many cases, has been a catalyst for change. The Texas Education Agency, as a matter of policy, is moving toward outcome-based education and will hold districts accountable if all students do not achieve the desired outcomes.

Statewide Technical Assistance

Texas Chapter 1 staff provides workshops, meetings, in-service training, and technical assistance to the local education agencies (LEAs) to assist them with establishing effective locally determined desired outcomes.

The state education agency (SEA) takes a very hands-on approach to giving technical assistance to schools once they are identified for improvement. Throughout the year, state staff give LEAs individual technical assistance on the school campus when requested. They also visit and consult with all schools identified as needing Chapter 1 joint plans. The SEA serves as a clearinghouse of information and regularly disseminates literature on successful programs and strategies.

Successful Models

An increasing number of program improvement schools in Texas have paired the gifted/talented teacher with Chapter 1 teachers in instructional strategies. Students from these two groups are also taught together— a practice that facilitates the development of advanced skills. In fact, the development of advanced skills is considered a very important aspect of SEA responsibility, which is emphasized to LEAs through workshops, mailouts, phone conversations, and on-site visits.

Exiting Program Improvement

The SEA encourages school systems to fully implement all improvements during the planning year. When a school experiences improvement in the achievement of their Chapter 1 students, the SEA sends a letter congratulating them for their gains and encouraging them to continue with the program improvement process even if they have tested out of program improvement.

Joint SEA/LEA Plans

The Texas Education Agency's joint plan process is as follows:

- The SEA asks LEAs to meet with the school team, review all assessment data, and write suggested modifications to the program, that address the identified problem areas.
- The SEA meets with the LEAs to discuss plans, after which priorities and follow-up action are addressed on a one-page form signed by all participants. The school team writes a joint plan that is submitted to the SEA, which is reviewed by an SEA consultant and approved by the LEA superintendent.

Funding for Program Improvement

All of the program improvement monies are used for mini-grants to schools identified for program improvement. All of FY91 program improvement funds have been distributed to date.

Approximately 15 percent of state administrative staff time is devoted to program improvement. Because there has been no new staff to help with these additional responsibilities, almost all of the Chapter 1 activities have been cut back due to insufficient time and resources.

Increasing Capacity for School Improvement

The SEA would like to hire additional staff to perform the responsibilities necessary to ensure that the state can adequately serve the children in Chapter 1 programs. The greatest increase in responsibilities for Chapter 1 has been in program improvement. Existing resources are insufficient to provide adequate assistance to identified schools.

Additional Chapter 1 Innovation and Reform

Schoolwide Projects

Number of schoolwide projects in Texas by school year:

1989-90	76
1990-91	164
1991-92	247

According to the SEA, an estimated 630 schools were eligible for schoolwide projects in 1990-91.

The Texas SEA strongly encourages the use of schoolwide projects in schools eligible to use them. The education agency provides a *Texas Chapter 1 Schoolwide Project Guide* to those schools implementing schoolwide projects. During the 1990-91 school year, the SEA sponsored a forum for selected LEAs. The forum, which focused on compliance issues, included presentations from large and small school districts implementing schoolwide projects.

The schoolwide projects in Texas have enabled schools to make a number of curriculum, instructional, and organizational changes. These include using the Accelerated Schools Model and the SEED computer-assisted instruction program and hiring new staff to lower the teacher-pupil ratio.

The SEA estimates that the following number of schools would be eligible for school-wide projects if the low-income eligibility threshold were reduced from 75 percent to the following levels: 950 schools at 60 percent, 1500 schools at 50 percent, and 1900 schools at 40 percent.

Coordination with the Regular Classroom

The Texas State Education Agency requirement has a mandatory coordination between Chapter 1 and regular classroom teachers. It does not, however, encourage one instructional design over others. Rather, it provides information on possible program designs and leaves the choice to the LEA or school.

Statewide Coordination

To improve statewide coordination, the Texas Department of Education requires each school and LEA to develop a plan for improvement. The SEA suggests Chapter 1 program improvement be part of the school plan, leaving the LEAs free to decide whether or not they wish to combine school improvement and Chapter 1 program improvement plans.

Texas funds a state compensatory education program that is administered and supervised by the same division and personnel as the Chapter 1 program. To decrease the confusion surrounding the state and federal compensatory education programs, the SEA has developed and mailed to all LEAs a question and answer document concerning the coordination of these two programs.

To streamline administrative paperwork, the SEA consolidates plans, grants waivers, and focuses on outcomes rather than processes.

The SEA encourages the use of Chapter 1 funds for preschool programs, but does not mandate it. Assistance is provided through technical assistance meetings and individual contacts with LEAs and schools. Limited-English-proficient students are selected for Chapter 1 services with a norm-referenced test given in either their primary language or in English, using an interpreter.

Students requiring special education are selected for Chapter 1 with the same criteria as other students and are admitted to the program to address their educational achievement, not their handicapping condition. A question- and answer- document has been developed to assist LEAs address this area.

To streamline administrative paperwork, the SEA consolidates plans, grants waivers, and focuses on outcomes rather than processes.

Making a Difference School by School

Program Improvement at Gabe P. Allen Elementary School, Dallas

Gabe P. Allen Elementary School is a majority-minority campus situated in an economically deprived neighborhood—evidenced in the fact that 91 percent of the students are on free, or reduced lunch. Of the 560 students, 82 percent are Hispanic, 10 percent are Black, 5 percent are Asian, and 2 percent are White. Fifty percent of these children are of limited English proficiency and

are enrolled in either bilingual education or an English-as-a-second language instructional program. The school has an average daily attendance rate of 95 percent.

Allen Elementary School believes that each child possesses the aptitude required to learn to read. If they are to succeed in school, they need to be successful readers. The instructional program is aimed at helping all students be successful in English reading or Spanish reading the first time. The program is called Read To Succeed/Exito Es Saber Leer.

Developmentally-appropriate experiences are provided for each pre-kindergarten and kindergarten student to enhance language acquisition and concepts in a creative mode and promote self-confidence. To lower the pupil/teacher ratio, the school has hired teacher assistants for the kindergarten classes.

First grade students having difficulty learning to read are paired with certified teachers to serve as their reading tutors. These tutors work with the targeted students on a one-on-one basis for thirty minutes daily. The tutors read with the child, diagnose and correct reading errors, work on specific reading skills, and practice writing sentences.

For students in grades 1-3, teachers spend most of their time on direct instruction and working with the students in cooperative groups. Literature books and the basal reading series are used as reading material for students, and teachers have reorganized the thematic units and curriculum to clearly determine skills to be mastered at each grade level. The teacher/pupil ratio was lowered in these classes by having tutors teach some of these reading groups as well.

Computers and appropriate coursework supplement classroom instruction with a computer-based language arts program focusing on reading, writing, and critical thinking. Two computer labs with forty student stations and two independent file managers will be needed for students. In addition to computer time, the computer teachers will provide direct instruction in collaboration with the classroom teacher. Four computers will also be placed in each of the 2nd and 3rd grade classrooms, which will be managed by the file server, thus providing students with access to their reading and writing files during the day.

Parents play a key role in Read To Succeed/Exito Es Saber Leer. Brochures describing the reading and writing programs were distributed to parents, and at the beginning of the year, teachers met with the parents to outline the objectives the children need to master during the year. The parents were then asked to support the program by signing contracts stating that they would listen to their children read fifteen minutes every night. In addition, a series of parent sessions will be offered throughout the year addressing various timely topics.

Utah

Chapter 1 Participation and Funding Summary

Participation Levels in School Year (SY) 1990-91

Number of Children Receiving Assistance:	30,513
Percentage of K-12 Children Served:	7%
Number and Percentage of School Districts Receiving Chapter 1 Assistance:	40; 100%
Number and Percentage of Schools Receiving Chapter 1 Assistance:	275; 38%

Chapter 1 Services by Grade Span in SY 1990-91

Preschool	<1%
Kindergarten	8%
Grades 1-3	46%
Grades 4-6	30%
Grades 7-12	16%

State Funding Levels by School Year

Formula Grants Allocation SY 1990-91, 1991-92:	$16,388,535; $18,988,132
Formula Grants Allocation SY 1992-93:	$21,344,179
Chapter 1 Per Pupil Expenditure SY 1990-91:	$537
Program Improvement Allocation SY 1991-92, 1992-93:	$90,000; $180,000

Chapter 1 Program Improvement Summary

Number of Schools in Program Improvement in SY 1991-92

Total Number of Schools in Program Improvement:	51
Percentage of Chapter 1 Schools in Program Improvement:	19%
Number of Schools in Joint Planning:	6

Statewide Minimum Standards for Improvement –Greater than zero normal curve equivalent (NCE) gain in basic and advanced skills and significant progress toward achieving the desired outcome determined at the local level.

Chapter 1 Program Improvement

Leveraging Accountability and Higher Performance

School Program Improvement (SPI) in Utah is an important means of getting the entire faculty working together as a unit to address inadequate learning gains among disadvantaged children. Collaborative teamwork in conjunction with effective instruction and regular in-service training gives vitality to Chapter 1 services and has the potential to improve the whole program, not just Chapter 1.

The State Committee of Practitioners (COP) has agreed to raise the statewide minimum standard for schools identified in need of SPI to one NCE. However, the COP has discouraged higher minimum statewide standards than those required by law.

Statewide Technical Assistance

Through in-service workshops and individual technical assistance, the state education agency (SEA) encourages both local education agencies (LEAs) and schools to establish desired outcomes in addition to NCE gains. However, the requirement to use NCE gains on standardized tests in addition to desired outcomes for evaluation purposes does not encourage districts to identify desired outcomes other than the minimum requirement of NCE gains.

For schools identified for improvement, the SEA provides an annual conference for SPI during which the schools receive instruction in effective implementation strategies. Schools also are encouraged to consider successful models as they modify their Chapter 1 program; emphasis is given to Effective Schools research, projects identified by the National Diffusion Network, and recipients of the Secretary's Initiative. The SEA also provides on-site technical assistance to schools involved in SPI.

The SEA has tried to reduce any potential negative association at the local level accompanying the identification of schools for program improvement. The SEA has openly discussed the benefits of the SPI process at statewide training sessions for LEA directors, statewide and regional training efforts for Chapter 1 personnel, and local visits with regular education and Chapter 1 teaching staff.

The SEA also has encouraged LEAs and local schools to consider ongoing improvement strategies for all schools, not just those identified for SPI. School superintendents and other administrators and teachers have participated in conferences that encourage educational reform and innovation.

Successful Models

The SEA has found that schools involved in SPI have chosen a wide variety of instructional strategies in their efforts to improve the quality of education for Chapter 1 students. Central to

those projects that have been most successful are the characteristics of: involvement of administration, regular education staff, Chapter 1 staff, and parents; analysis of program and student needs; regular, ongoing coordination between Chapter 1 and the regular classroom teacher; focused effort; joint in-service training for regular education and Chapter 1 personnel; and hard work and commitment.

Exiting Program Improvement

Approximately 37 percent of schools identified for SPI based on the 1989-90 testing cycle later tested out of the program before their plans were fully implemented. The state feels that the development and partial implementation of the SPI plan helped the identified schools achieve improved NCE gains.

The SEA encourages schools that achieve NCE gains at the end of the first year of SPI to continue in the improvement process by making those schools that voluntarily implement their plans eligible for SPI funds. About one-third of the schools eligible for this option choose to implement their SPI plans fully and voluntarily.

Joint SEA/LEA Plans

SEA, LEA, and school representatives work as a team to analyze previous SPI efforts, school achievement, and needs to determine the best approach in developing a joint SPI plan that will help the school to meet the needs of the Chapter 1 children. The SEA also serves as liaison to help identify and provide additional support to the schools as needed. The SEA provides follow-up technical assistance to help monitor the effectiveness of plan implementation. Schools identified for joint SEA/LEA SPI plans receive program improvement funds to assist in the implementation of the joint SPI plan.

Most joint plans call for increased monitoring of individual student progress, increased coordination with the regular teaching staff, increased parental involvement, and a specific focus for instructional improvement. No results are yet available on the first joint SPI plans.

Funding for Program Improvement

All program improvement funds are provided to LEAs in the form of mini-grants based on a formula. The state has distributed 94 percent of the 1990-91 SPI funds. Of that, approximately 59 percent has been claimed. One factor that slows the process considerably is that more than half of the LEAs have chosen to do fall-fall testing for evaluation purposes. Often the SEA does not have a final count of schools identified for SPI until February. This delay makes it difficult to grant SPI funds to schools early in the school year and even more difficult for schools identified at mid-year to use the SPI funds until the following school year.

Approximately 30 percent of state administration staff time is devoted to responsibilities related to program improvement. All of state technical assistance for program improvement is paid for by state administrative funds; none of the program improvement funds are used for this purpose.

Increasing Capacity for School Improvement

The one area of state administration that has been reduced because of program improvement efforts is monitoring of LEAs. Limited time has caused this reduction. The SEA efforts in monitoring look at both compliance and programmatic issues. This includes specific review of many of the requirements related to both school and student program improvement. Because of the additional workload created by new provisions provided by P.L. 100-297, (for example, schoolwide projects, increased evaluation, school program improvement) the SEA administrative staff is unable to provide as much school improvement technical assistance to LEAs and local schools as it should. Increased resources would enable the SEA to provide additional staff to help meet specific needs. The SEA could provide additional technical assistance to LEAs in the areas of development of quality desired outcome goals, identification and implementation of authentic assessment strategies to better evaluate the achievement of Chapter 1 students, and reform efforts to improve the quality of Chapter 1 instruction.

Additional Chapter 1 Innovation and Reform

Schoolwide Projects

Number of schoolwide projects in the Utah by school year:

1989-90:	1
1990-91:	4
1991-92:	12

Eight schools were eligible for Chapter 1 schoolwide projects in 1990-91.

The eligible schools have received technical assistance from the SEA and/or the TACs that work out of Denver. Assistance was provided in the areas of data analysis, the planning process, and identification of promising educational practices, and exemplary programs.

The SEA has provided technical assistance to schools implementing schoolwide projects. Initially, applicable laws and regulations were discussed with school personnel. Two or more on-site visits were made during the analysis and planning period. Follow-up visits were accomplished during the initial implementation phase of the projects and one or more visits have been made to schoolwide projects each year as the programs have progressed.

Curriculum, instructional, and program changes have been undertaken in schools that have schoolwide projects. Changes vary among schoolwide projects. For example, in Salt Lake City, more emphasis has been placed on the use of WICAT computer-assisted instruc-

tional materials. Also, there has been some re-alignment of how school personnel are used wherein regular staff members and Chapter 1 staff members are serving in different groups and in a different pattern. For example, a cooperative learning approach is used at the beginning of the school day in intensive reading practice. Also, schoolwide projects have been given authority to proceed on a site-based approach in the Salt Lake City School District. In the Ogden School District, regular classroom teachers in schoolwide projects are provided in-class Chapter 1 teaching assistants to support a lower student-to-teacher instructional ratio.

The SEA estimates that over 75 percent of the schoolwide projects will have difficulty meeting performance improvement criteria. There are a number of reasons that contribute to this circumstance:

- Recently developed test editions such as the Stanford Achievement Test make it difficult to obtain the same percentile as compared with the previous edition (7th edition) of the test. Also, this could impact on gains that students make when comparisons are made with the three previous years.
- Schoolwide projects, typically, are educationally disadvantaged to a greater degree than non-schoolwide Chapter 1 schools. This makes it difficult for schoolwide projects to make gains comparable to the other schools.
- Initially, when changes are made in curriculum or instruction, there may not be related gains in student achievement. It takes time for staff members to learn how to use new curriculum materials and to receive in-service training in new instructional techniques. Consequently, there may be some slippage during this transition period.

Most school staff members who have become involved in schoolwide projects have worked hard to plan and make changes in the instructional program. Often, changes are made in the second and third year to improve the program. The SEA is fearful of what might happen if it is required to say, "You can't continue as a schoolwide project at the end of this year." It could have a very negative impact on people who have been willing to change and have invested a lot of effort in the schoolwide process. It might be quite a letdown for them and their reaction might be, "I tried it once, but I'm not going to do it again."

Collaborative teamwork in conjunction with effective instruction and regular in-service training gives vitality to Chapter 1 services and has the potential to improve the whole program, not just Chapter 1.

The SEA estimates that the following number of schools would be eligible for schoolwide projects if the low-income eligibility threshold were lowered from 75 percent to the following levels: 24 schools at 60 percent, 41 schools at 50 percent, and 66 schools at 40 percent.

Coordination with the Regular Classroom

The SEA encourages LEAs to provide Chapter 1 services in the regular classroom and to coordinate services with the regular classroom teacher by means of more in-class projects; various, new Chapter 1/regular program communication procedures; in-service training attended by both regular teachers and Chapter 1 teachers attend; various collaborative methods of instructional delivery, such as teaming; and cooperative evaluation of students.

By way of statewide efforts in teacher preparation to help Chapter 1 and regular classroom teachers support the regular program, the SEA has established a core curriculum. Regular teachers and Chapter 1 teachers subscribe to the standards of the core and cooperatively focus their instruction on the same core concepts at the same time.

Statewide Coordination

Utah has developed a state core curriculum and core assessment. The regular district program and Chapter 1 work together to ensure that students master the core standards at an acceptable level. At the elementary grades, end-of-year core tests and criterion-referenced tests are administered in reading, mathematics, science, social studies, and so on. Both the regular program and Chapter 1 use these results to determine how students are progressing. No similar program improvement funds are appropriated in Utah, so there are no separate program improvement efforts at any Chapter 1 schools.

The SEA is working to streamline administrative paperwork requirements at the local level. State Chapter 1 personnel and the RMC TAC Region E are currently conducting data processing training sessions with LEA personnel. A Chapter 1 information management program, entitled CHIMP, will allow LEAs to collect and aggregate most of the information required by state and federal governments. Also, it is designed to aggregate data efficiently for report and program analysis purposes.

LEAs have been encouraged to consider providing services for preschool and kindergarten students. There were some increases in kindergarten programs this past year but, to date, the SEA has not received any LEA applications requesting services for pre-kindergarten students. The SEA has had several meetings with Head Start personnel. LEAs were encouraged to apply for Head Start-public school (Chapter 1) transi-

tion grants this past spring.

Chapter 1 participation of special education and bilingual students has been encouraged by the State Office of Education because these students are educationally disadvantaged. The determination of such placement is made at the school level. Districts have employed bilingual aides to assist students who are having language problems. Utah has a fairly large number of handicapped children participating in Chapter 1.

It is difficult to coordinate Chapter 1 with state compensatory education and bilingual education because these programs are in a special purpose optional category. How these funds are used is strictly an LEA decision. Utah's appropriation for compensatory education was $500,000; for bilingual education it was $250,000. These funds are distributed on a formula basis; the amount each LEA receives is quite limited. Most of the bilingual funds have been spent on alternative high school programs.

LEAs have the primary responsibility for providing meaningful instruction to students with limited English proficiency. LEAs can enroll limited-English-proficient (LEP) students in Chapter 1 if they determine that the child is educationally disadvantaged in the subject areas of reading, math, or language arts. Many LEAs have employed bilingual teachers and teaching assistants to assist LEP students in the Chapter 1 program.

This year, five regional in-service training workshops were held throughout the state to assist district and school personnel in diagnosing student needs and in designing appropriate instructional programs. LEAs know they are to serve children with special education needs who are educationally disadvantaged. Usually, when a special education student has his or her case considered at the local school level, a determination is made regarding which placement is most appropriate or whether the child should participate in both programs. Some districts have employed teachers who have special education training to manage programs for Chapter 1 and special education. These jointly funded staff members are required to maintain time logs that are used to determine the amounts that should be paid by each program.

Making a Difference School by School

Program Improvement at Columbia Elementary School, Jordan School District

Columbia Elementary School has taken advantage of the program improvement process to make a positive impact on the whole school. When it was determined that the school was in need of school program improvement, a committee was formed at the school. The entire staff, however, became involved in the input and decision-making process. The principal recognized the importance of her role in providing leadership and support for the effort.

The staff looked closely at the school's academic program to identify specific strengths and weaknesses. Reading test scores in grades 2 and 5 showed significant losses. An analysis of the reading basal for these grades revealed an inadequate development of curriculum objectives and supporting instructional materials. Supplementary curriculum and instructional materials were identified and provided for staff members. The school decided to purchase another reading basal series for the following school year.

The team also studied several innovative projects to identify different instructional strategies that would help students to improve their more advanced skills. The Talents Unlimited project from Mobile, Alabama, was chosen to provide in-service training. The school principal used state career ladder and Chapter 1 SPI funds to involve the entire teaching staff in the in-service training. After an overview of the Talents Unlimited project, school personnel decided to focus the first year of their efforts on certain aspects of the model and to follow up with other aspects in subsequent years.

Test results showed that the school made aggregate performance gains of 7.11 NCEs for the 1989-90 school year as compared to -.79 for the 1988-89 school year. Although the school elected to graduate out of SPI after showing such strong gains during the planning year of SPI, the school was committed to continuing with the plan that it had developed and to fully implement the Talents Unlimited model for serving all students.

Vermont

Chapter 1 Participation and Funding Summary

Participation Levels in School Year (SY) 1990-91

Number of Children Served:	9,786
Percentage of K-12 Children Served:	10%
Number and Percentage of School Districts Receiving Chapter 1 Assistance:	61; 100%
Number and Percentage of Schools Receiving Chapter 1 Assistance:	299; 85%

Chapter 1 Services by Grade Span in SY 1990-91

Preschool	5%
Kindergarten	4%
Grades 1-3	50%
Grades 4-6	25%
Grades 7-12	16%

State Funding Levels by School Year

Formula Grants Allocation SY 1990-91, 1991-92:	$10,740,478; $12,425,464
Formula Grants Allocation SY 1992-93:	$14,407,908
Chapter 1 Per Pupil Expenditure SY 1990-91:	$1,076
Program Improvement Allocation SY 1991-92, 1992-93:	$90,000; $180,000

Chapter 1 Program Improvement Summary

Number of Schools in Program Improvement in SY 1991-92

Total Number of Schools in Program Improvement:	64
Percentage of Chapter 1 Schools in Program Improvement:	21%
Number of Schools in Joint Planning:	7

Statewide Minimum Standards for Improvement–At least a zero normal curve equivalent (NCE) gain in aggregate achievement for basic and advanced skills and achievement of other desired outcomes as submitted on Chapter 1 applications.

Chapter 1 Program Improvement

Leveraging Accountability and Higher Performance

The Vermont state education agency (SEA) believes that if it is to meet the national and state goals for education, Chapter 1 programs must improve. Since Chapter 1 accounts for only 5 percent of the instruction to eligible children, the success of program improvement is dependent on its effect on the regular program as well.

Vermont goes well beyond the use of NCE gains on standardized tests by requiring the use of desired outcomes. These are additional measures, which a school or community merits as important and a more accurate measure of performance than NCE scores.

The Vermont SEA is not currently in the process of raising the minimum standard. The Committee of Practitioners has discouraged any increase in the NCE standards because it is seen as an inaccurate measure of student learning. Forty-eight percent of LEAs have aggregate achievement objectives that exceed the minimum.

Statewide Technical Assistance

The SEA encourages and helps schools to establish effective, locally determined, desired outcomes through an SEA requirement on schools' application to the program. Further, through technical assistance workshops, the schools are encouraged to write desired outcomes that measure success in the regular classroom, and in some cases, complement the portfolio assessment used in Vermont.

Once identified for improvement, schools receive technical assistance from the SEA, including an extensive video and audio resource library on staff development topics; field consultation from SEA staff; topical training in math and reading strategies; suggested formats for writing program improvement plans; focus workshops on the program improvement process; services from the Technical Assistance Center and Rural Technical Assistance Center (TAC and RTAC) in coordination with the SEA; on-site presentations to school boards, parents, and teachers; and mini-grants, which are reviewed on a case-by-case basis for implementation of the program improvement plan.

The SEA supports the development of advanced skills by requiring the reporting of pertinent data on annual evaluations, supporting the inclusion of the state portfolio system into Chapter 1 programs, providing training in areas such as the National Math Standards, and promoting local desired outcomes that measure success in the regular classroom.

To support the adoption of successful models in program improvement schools, the SEA makes on-site visits, disseminates literature and information about successful models, and has helped form and financially support, a collabo-

rative in Reading Recovery (one model for first-year students).

The SEA has developed a companion, multi-year improvement effort called Program Development Design to reduce the potential negative association with program improvement. Further, the SEA has had ongoing dialogue with teachers and administrators about the process. The schools involved with the joint planning process participate in a regional planning process that reviews program improvement and its relation to the school as a whole. This process is executed with the assistance of the TAC and RTAC.

Exiting Program Improvement

Thirty-three percent of schools identified during the 1989-90 test cycle tested out of program improvement in the next testing cycle. The SEA encourages schools that test out of program improvement to continue implementation by meeting the state's Program Development requirement, by allowing the schools to continue using the program improvement funds they have already received, and by supporting the efforts the schools put into the process.

Joint SEA/LEA Plans

The SEA requires that schools identified for joint planning participate in a planning process with the state. In the first year, the schools meet regionally with a SEA consultant and the TAC and RTAC. The two-day sessions, held a month apart, focus first on team building, second, on the change process, third, on data review from non-traditional sources, and finally, on coordination with the regular classroom and the school program improvement plan. A SEA consultant is assigned to a school and participates regularly with the joint program improvement team. Funds are available to schools with joint plans for both planning and implementation. Thus far, schools have spent a lot of time visiting programs outside of Vermont to find successful models. As an example, one school in joint planning will use program improvement funds to pilot an after-school program offering extra instruction time from regular classroom teachers and after-hours transportation for students who need it. Though no achievement results are available, schools participating in joint planning appear to have a broader school base of participation and a very positive attitude toward program improvement.

Funding for Program Improvement

Approximately 30 percent of state administrative staff time is devoted to the responsibilities of program improvement. This represents all the state technical assistance for program improvement.

Unfortunately, the extra time involved with program improvement means that schools not in program improvement are receiving less technical assistance than before and attention to regulations has decreased.

Increasing Capacity for School Improvement

The SEA needs more information on alternatives to norm-referenced testing that can be used by local programs to give instruction and to determine whether the program is having an impact on the system. The SEA wants to minimize testing that is not an integral part of instruction and to gather information on assessment procedures that can be used to determine success in the regular classroom. This information is not available through the TAC. With additional resources, capacity could be built at the SEA and LEA levels by connecting with the authentic/alternative assessment work of education experts.

Additional Chapter 1 Innovation and Reform

Schoolwide Projects

At this time Vermont does not have any schoolwide projects. Three schools are currently eligible.

The SEA estimates that the following number of schools would be eligible for schoolwide projects if the low-income eligibility threshold was lowered from 75 percent to the following levels: 12 schools at 60 percent, 21 schools at 50 percent, and 31 schools at 40 percent.

Coordination with the Regular Classroom

The SEA supports math and writing portfolio training as requested by schools in program improvement because portfolios, as an alternative assessment model, are a measure of success in the regular classroom. A variety of reading in-service workshops have been held as well, the latest of which focused on classroom strategies for the early reader. The SEA supports all types of local in-service efforts to ensure success in the regular classroom.

To support success for Chapter 1 children in the regular classroom, the SEA sponsors a number local and regional training sessions. A good example is a math training session, held four separate days throughout Vermont. It provided hands-on activities related to the national math standards and addressed the Vermont math portfolios.

Varied models of coordination with the regular program are appearing in program improvement schools. The Reading Recovery and integrated in-class models are two commonly used models. When in-class models are utilized, a designated common planning time is given to allow the classroom and Chapter 1 teacher to design teaching modifications and strategies. This gives Chapter 1 children a better chance at success in specific language arts and/or math lessons.

A common language and knowledge of instructional practices is developing among teachers in both models. Currently, Vermont's Common Core of Learning is being developed; it will soon help to provide guidance in curriculum development.

Statewide Coordination

Every activity in Vermont focuses on improving schools. Although there are no formal state-required improvement efforts that schools must implement, there are a number of ways that Chapter 1 sup-

ports statewide school improvement. Vermont's state law (Act 230) requires that every school in the state develop a comprehensive system of educational services to enable all students to succeed in the regular classroom to the extent possible. Schools are required to establish instructional support teams that provide advice and assistance to classroom teachers on strategies to deal with students who are difficult to teach. Chapter 1 and special education are key components of the schools' comprehensive system.

Vermont's state Chapter 1 program improvement plan requires all Vermont schools that have Chapter 1 programs to enter into Program Development. Schools are encouraged to link their Chapter 1 improvement efforts to other schoolwide improvement efforts.

A Chapter 1 resource library established at the state level, consists of videos, audiotapes, and printed materials that focus on improving school programs' ability to respond to difficult-to-teach students. These resources are available to schools in program improvement and program development. In fact, they have been so successful that school principals are borrowing materials and including all teachers — not just Chapter 1— in the improvement process.

Vermont has established a statewide portfolio program in writing and math, grades 4 and 8. The standards that have been established are excellent indicators of student success. Many Chapter 1 programs are using portfolio results as another desired outcome and are expanding portfolios beyond the state-required grades 4 and 8.

Chapter 1 and Chapter 2 programs are administered by the same person. There are efforts to coordinate both programs to support school improvement.

For a number of years, the SEA has had a Chapter 1 staff member whose job it is to review paperwork requirements and reduce and streamline where possible. Local coordinators have told the SEA that the paperwork requirements are generally not a burden. The SEA has developed a computerized database that some of the districts are using to track their Chapter 1 programs.

Most Chapter 1 programs are small and are administered by a school principal or an administrator who also works with special education or curriculum coordination. Because there are not as many layers or bureaucracy, administrative procedures are kept to a minimum.

An early childhood education team has been established at the SEA, which is responsible for developing linkages both within the department and in the field. This team consists of representatives from the special education, Part H, state early education, and Chapter 1 programs. As Head Start in Vermont is diffuse, the SEA has not been successful yet in establishing an ongoing working relationship within this team. Even Start and Adult Basic Education programs will also be brought into this collaborative process, and a focus on family literacy will be established.

Vermont recognizes the need for early intervention for students at risk of failure. One-third of the state's Chapter 1 programs have a preschool component. Because the state is small, many programs are jointly sponsored by Chapter 1, special education, and state early education funds. The SEA has gone beyond needing to encourage early intervention (everyone has it, wants it, or wants more) and is at the stage of advocating for effective, developmentally appropriate interventions.

The state has prepared an information sheet on Chapter 1 and special education that highlights similarities and differences between the two programs. Questions and answers on the topic are also included in the Chapter 1 handbook. Communication is also made much easier by the fact that Chapter 1 and special education are administered by the same person locally in more than 80 percent of the districts.

The special education eligibility regulations have been revamped to ensure that only students who have a disability and are in need of specially designed instruction are identified as eligible. As a result of this and extensive training efforts, the percentage of students identified as eligible has gone down over the past two years. The goal of the SEA is to meet the needs of many, if not all, of the mildly disabled students using supports other than the paperwork/litigation intensive special education system. The Act 230 efforts move in that direction.

Many Chapter 1 programs are using portfolio results as another desired outcome and are expanding portfolios beyond the state-required grades 4 and 8.

The SEA relies on information provided in the federal policy manual to provide services for students with limited English proficiency (LEP). The SEA has a small LEP population in the state and there have been no requests for further clarification from local districts.

Making a Difference School by School

Joint Program Improvement Plan at Whitingham School, Whitingham

Whitingham is a rural K-12 school located in southwest Vermont. When first identified as a program improvement school three years ago, the Chapter 1 program improvement plan was written by the central office, which viewed the plan as a requirement that could be effectively handled through their office. Whitingham School never developed

any ownership of the plan and did not know of its existence until it became involved in the joint program improvement process.

The staff at Whitingham were incredulous when they learned they were identified as a joint program improvement school. For the past year, they had been involved in a restructuring effort to reorganize their service delivery for Chapter 1. They had re-designed their pull-out program to an in-class model. Teams of REACH personnel made up of Chapter 1, special education, and speech and language staff were formed in order to share information. However, even though a new structure was in place, important components of successful collaboration between Chapter 1 staff and the regular classroom were missing.

By attending state-sponsored program improvement workshops and receiving technical assistance from state consultants back in their school, the Whitingham joint program improvement team began a needs assessment of their Chapter 1 program. Joint program improvement team members include the principal, Chapter 1 teacher, paraprofessional, classroom teacher, and parent.

Currently, the members of Whitingham's joint program improvement team are developing and implementing a plan to improve the effectiveness of their REACH teams and Chapter 1 program. They now see the importance of developing strong communication skills and trust among Chapter 1 staff and classroom teachers. Through team planning at the school level, the team is developing clear, measurable objectives related to classroom instruction as well as desired local outcomes. Providing a common method for teaching language arts and math through workshops attended by classroom teachers and Chapter 1 staff is another priority. They are aware of how they must set priorities and limit training so that the staff do not feel overwhelmed.

Although initially reluctant to participate in the joint program improvement process, the principal now acknowledges that the SEA-sponsored workshops, joint program improvement process and plan, and on-site technical assistance have assisted the school in improving communication skills and developing ownership of the Chapter 1 program at the school level.

Virginia

Chapter 1 Participation and Funding Summary

Participation Levels in School Year (SY) 1990-91

Number of Children Served:	71,419
Percentage of K-12 Children Served:	8%
Number and Percentage of School Districts Receiving Chapter 1 Assistance:	135; 100%
Number and Percentage of Schools Receiving Chapter 1 Assistance:	857; 50%

Chapter 1 Services by Grade Span in SY 1990-91

Preschool	3%
Kindergarten	3%
Grades 1-3	53%
Grades 4-6	35%
Grades 7-12	6%

State Funding Levels by School Year

Formula Grants Allocation SY 1990-91, 1991-92:	$97,562,531; $114,263,374
Formula Grants Allocation SY 1992-93:	$119,479,436
Chapter 1 Per Pupil Expenditure SY 1990-91:	$615
Program Improvement Allocation SY 1991-92, 1992-93:	$272,785; $432,806

Chapter 1 Program Improvement Summary

Number of Schools in Program Improvement in SY 1991-92

Total Number of Schools in Program Improvement:	189
Percentage of Chapter 1 Schools in Program Improvement:	22%
Number of Schools in Joint Planning:	15

Statewide Minimum Standards for Improvement-A normal curve equivalent (NCE) gain greater than one in both advanced and basic skills and success meeting at least two of the three required locally determined desired outcomes.

Chapter 1 Program Improvement

Leveraging Accountability and Higher Performance

The Virginia Department of Education supports program improvement because it provides a framework for improving services to at-risk children by leveraging improvement for the whole school.

Statewide Technical Assistance

The state education agency (SEA), in cooperation with the Chapter 1 Technical Assistance Center (TAC), provides technical assistance to schools identified for program improvement through conferences, workshops, and regular on-site visits by state staff.

The SEA Chapter 1 staff provide workshops, meetings, in-service training, and technical assistance to the local education agencies (LEAs) to assist them in establishing effective locally determined desired outcomes.

The state has countered the negative reaction that accompanies identification of schools for program improvement by holding regular meetings with LEA coordinators, division superintendents, school principals, and staff on changes in the program improvement standards. The SEA also conducts technical assistance meetings for Chapter 1 personnel in the school divisions.

Successful Models

Virginia's Chapter 1 program improvement schools have employed a number of instructional strategies and curriculum models. Two of these are the National Supervision Network and the Chapter 1 Recognition Program. The SEA also disseminates the most innovative strategies and conducts ongoing consultation with local school divisions.

To emphasize the development of advanced skills and the adoption of successful models, the SEA encourages school districts to participate in state-designed training programs on a regional level. State staff consult with local school officials in identifying strategies for improvement and also serve on local and state improvement teams.

Exiting Program Improvement

The SEA encourages school systems to fully implement all improvements during the planning year. If a school tests out at the end of the first year, they are encouraged, through technical assistance to LEA coordinators, principals, and teachers, to continue the program improvement process.

Joint SEA/LEA Plans

Beginning with a summer workshop on strategies for improving programs, the SEA employs a comprehensive, year-long strategy for establishing joint plans with LEAs that require them. The state emphasizes a team approach to building strategies, and provides numerous workshops for LEA staff at the TAC. On-site visits and meetings by state staff are also conducted on a regular basis.

Funding for Program Improvement

Seventy-five percent of FY91 program improvement funds were distributed as of February 1992. Approximately 25 percent of state administrative staff time is devoted to program improvement responsibilities.

Increasing Capacity for School Improvement

The SEA is looking forward to hiring a new staff person in the summer of 1992 to help cover a magnitude of areas including outcome goals, testing, needs assessment, data management, and joint LEA/SEA projects.

Additional Chapter 1 Innovation and Reform

Schoolwide Projects

Number of schoolwide projects in Virginia by school year:

1990-91	9
1991-92	13

The SEA strongly encourages the use of schoolwide projects in all eligible schools.

Schoolwide projects have enabled schools in Virginia to make a number of curricular, instructional, and organizational changes. These include hiring a curriculum specialist, employing the Middle School Concept, and developing a curriculum guide that emphasizes teaching children at risk.

The SEA makes the following projections of the number of schools in the state that would be eligible for schoolwide projects if the low-income eligibility thresholds were reduced from 75 percent to the following levels: 19 schools at 60 percent, 33 schools at 50 percent, and 53 schools at 40 percent.

Coordination with the Regular Classroom

The SEA encourages LEAs to provide Chapter 1 services in the regular classroom and to coordinate services with the regular classroom teachers in a number of different ways. Virginia sponsors a Statewide Compensatory Program in reading and math for children in the lowest quartile. The SEA also provides monitoring review teams for all programs, encourages the development of a joint comprehensive plan for all children, coordinates early childhood programs, and integrates the Chapter 1 requirement into the overall school improvement structure. For Chapter 1 and regular teachers, the SEA sponsors workshops, in-service training programs, and a conference on working with children at risk.

Statewide Coordination

To improve statewide coordination, the Virginia Chapter 1 staff serve on Administrative Review Teams to monitor compliance. The SEA also operates a statewide compensatory program in grades K-12 in reading and mathematics. School divisions must submit a Chapter 1 remedial plan for serving eligible children using one of three options. This plan is due prior to the approval of the Chapter 1 application.

The state operates a state-sponsored compensatory program for grades K-12. All children in the lowest quartile must be served with state and local funds before using Chapter 1 funds. Goals and monitoring requirements are similar and coordinated with the Administrative Review Teams.

The SEA is taking action to streamline the administrative and paperwork requirements by reviewing all reports at the SEA office for possible combination, computerization, or elimination.

To coordinate Chapter 1 with other early childhood programs serving disadvantaged students, SEA staff members work on teams to develop a preschool model for working with other agencies. The SEA has also developed a Chapter 1 policy to assist LEAs with coordinating services.

Efforts to coordinate Chapter 1 with special education include regular meetings and team meetings of Chapter 1 and special education staff. Limited-English-proficient (LEP) students are selected by the same criteria and policies used to select Chapter 1 students.

Making a Difference School by School

Schoolwide Project at Whitcomb Court Elementary, Richmond

The schoolwide project at Whitcomb Court Elementary School has brought about a number of new programs and personnel, including: a reading resource teacher to assist in the delivery of instruction, a resource teacher trained to work with students with exceptional learning difficulties, an accelerated learning teacher to work with students characterized as gifted and/or talented, and a Parent Volunteer Trainer to coordinate parent efforts.

Cooperative learning groups have also been formed to help pupils take more responsibility for their own learning, and incentive programs reward and honor academic achievement and encourage self-discipline. In addition, a Jostens Learning Computer laboratory supplements regular classroom instruc-

State staff consult with local school officials in identifying strategies for improvement and also serve on local and state improvement teams.

tion in reading and mathematics, a Writing-To-Read Computer laboratory assesses the reading and writing needs of kindergarten and 1st grade students, and a tutorial program in grades 3 through 5 assists students in maintaining and enriching skills mastered during the primary focus.

The Effective Schools correlates are used for a basis of instruction and the Whitcomb staff has received in-depth training in this area. A collegial relationship between teachers and administrators is an essential part of the success of the model . A positive school climate, effective instructional leadership, high expectations for students, and academic goals and objectives based on the realization that all children can learn contribute to the success of Whitcomb Court's schoolwide project.

Program Improvement at Robert E. Lee Elementary, Petersburg

The Robert E. Lee Elementary School program improvement plan emphasizes the importance of parental involvement in its Chapter 1 activities. Monthly meetings with parents will provide a better understanding of the Chapter 1 programs, and workshops on the Chapter 1 reading program will be conducted to help parents gain a greater understanding of the reading and writing needs of their kindergarten and 1st grade students.

The program improvement plan also requires the use of surveys to obtain input concerning goals, objectives, and evaluation of Chapter 1; communication logs to provide coordination between the regular classroom and Chapter 1; and progress reports that are completed every nine-week period to summarize the progress of students attending the Chapter 1 centers.

The whole-language philosophy of teaching reading will be used in all Chapter 1 reading centers. In-depth training in this area for all Chapter 1 teachers and support personnel provides consistency within the instructional components. Instructional techniques of regular classroom and Chapter 2 teachers will be closely monitored by the administration and Chapter 1 program specialist to ensure the effectiveness of the delivery services.

Washington

Chapter 1 Participation and Funding Summary

Participation Levels in School Year (SY) 1990-91

Number of Children Served:	62,132
Percentage of K-12 Children Served:	7%
Number and Percentage of School Districts Receiving Chapter 1 Assistance:	284; 96%
Number and Percentage of Schools Receiving Chapter 1 Assistance:	990; 45%

Chapter 1 Services by Grade Span in SY 1990-91

Preschool	<1%
Kindergarten	7%
Grades 1-3	51%
Grades 4-6	26%
Grades 7-12	15%

State Funding Levels by School Year

Formula Grants Allocation SY 1990-91, 1991-92:	$55,017,024; $58,631,406
Formula Grants Allocation SY 1992-93:	$65,429,656
Chapter 1 Per Pupil Expenditure SY 1990-91:	$885
Program Improvement Allocation SY 1991-92, 1992-93:	$172,820; $287,356

Chapter 1 Program Improvement Summary

Number of Schools in Program Improvement in SY 1991-92

Total Number of Schools in Program Improvement:	106
Percentage of Chapter 1 Schools in Program Improvement:	11%
Number of Schools in Joint Planning:	3

Statewide Minimum Standards for Improvement–A positive normal curve equivalent, (NCE) gain and one other desired outcome which is stated in the district application and which must reflect success in the regular classroom.

Chapter 1 Program Improvement

Leveraging Accountability and Higher Performance

The Chapter 1 program improvement provisions have the potential to serve as a framework for statewide school improvement. By taking a comprehensive look at their total program, local education agencies (LEAs) are exploring ways to improve the performance and program for low-performing children. At the school level, the program improvement planning and implementation process is bringing whole schools together as a team to provide the most coordinated and effective education for children receiving Chapter 1 services.

Statewide Technical Assistance

The state minimum standard in 1989 was a positive NCE gain and no other desired outcome. The state education agency has increased the standard by requiring a minimum of one other desired outcome. The Committee of Practitioners (COP) agrees with the standards as set and is not interested in raising or lowering them.

Most LEAs set their aggregate achievement objectives at the state minimum standard, although there were several districts that exceeded the state standard. Higher local standards ranged from a two NCE gain to a ten NCE gain, although the majority were close to two NCEs. An estimated 30 percent of the LEAs were identified for program improvement with objectives higher than a positive NCE gain.

Because the SEA believes that performance of a child, school, district, and state should never be assessed on one piece of information, Washington decided to require other desired outcomes. At the state's regional spring workshops, staff assist LEAs in developing desired outcomes that suit each school's population, curriculum, and staff.

The SEA emphasizes to LEAs that outcomes should be indicative of the Chapter 1 students' success in the regular classroom. LEAs are encouraged to ensure that the outcomes reflect their particular situation and can be a meaningful part of instruction for the students. The Technical Assistance Center (TAC) and Rural Technical Assistance Center (RTAC) staff have been especially helpful in this area. Every year the application packet includes the Chapter 1 Regular Basic Program Concepts Guide, which covers a variety of areas including needs assessment, program design, evaluation, program improvement, school selection, and the development, implementation, and evaluatation of desired outcomes. A form has also been developed to help the LEAs write the actual outcomes on their application.

LEAs apply for program improvement funds on mini-grant applications. Most monies are used for staff release time to coordinate instruction and materials, staff in-service, curriculum addi-

tions, advanced skills materials, and parent activities.

The SEA, TAC, RTAC and members of the COP are developing a video for schools identified for program improvement. The video will attempt to eliminate the fear or stigma of being identified by showing the successes from other LEAs in the state and profiling the Washington program improvement process. Additional materials, including a variety of self-assessment forms, parental information, and curriculum standards, will be given out in conjunction with the video.

The SEA, TAC, RTAC, and COP are training local staff knowledgeable about Chapter 1 to provide individualized assistance to schools identified for program improvement. Three groups of local staff, consisting primarily of teachers, have been trained to assist schools with gathering information, targeting areas for improvement, and developing and implementing a plan. Research is a critical component of each facet.

This project will provide LEAs with a listing of the consultants, their experience, and how to contact them. The SEA strongly encourages LEAs identified for program improvement to contact these consultants who will give individual attention as needed. The local staff will be supported by the SEA, TAC, and RTAC staff, but will be able to provide services quicker and more efficiently than the other organizations offer. The SEA believes that local staff assisting local staff has great potential and will result in better plans and better services to students, both in Chapter 1 and in the regular classroom.

Materials provided to LEAs on parent involvement will consist of a parent kit, guidelines, video, and other resources. The local consultants will also assist LEAs in encouraging parents to be partners in their child's education.

The philosophy of the Washington state SEA is to encourage LEAs to design programs based on the individual needs of students, resulting in services, instruction, and models that may vary from school to school, student to student, and grade level to grade level. This message is given in every technical assistance and monitoring visit, workshop, and document provided to LEAs. The state regulations also reflect this philosophy, which has resulted in many unique programs.

Providing individual attention to each school and corresponding materials helps lessen the negative association of being identified for program improvement. At this point, the SEA has not had meetings with principals or superintendents, although such meetings are an activity the SEA would like to pursue.

Successful Models

At the annual Washington Association of Grants Managers Conference (WAGM), many successful programs throughout the state are highlighted. Several districts are purchasing materials and implementing programs that emphasize advanced skills, and other districts are training staff in the Reading Recovery. All program improvement plans must address advanced skills.

More and more programs are changing from skill and drill worksheets to more meaningful activities. Programs tend to focus on both reading and language arts, providing students the time to write and to respond to literature. Math instruction includes more hands-on activities, and emphasizes math concepts.

Most plans also include strategies for teaching advanced skills. Another area that is often included is reviewing tests to assure a tight fit between curriculum and the test used.

Joint SEA/LEA Plans

This is the first year the state has identified schools needing joint plans. There are currently three schools in the state that qualify, and to date two plans have been designed. Each of these locations will receive an on-site visit from an SEA staff person and will be linked with a program improvement consultant acting as the prime contact person. The consultant will assist the LEA in developing their plan in close coordination with SEA, TAC, and RTAC staff. The SEA will have the final sign-off to the plan. The schools with joint plans will have first access to the program improvement funds.

Funding for Program Improvement

Approximately 60 percent of program improvement money is being used for mini-grants to LEAs. The SEA is using the money to provide a systematic approach to program improvement through the use of the consultants and materials. These resources will provide better services for individual schools, instead of adding one more grant a district has to manage. As of February 1992, the SEA had distributed all of the 1990-91 program improvement funds, and 85 percent of the 1991-92 program improvement funds. There are no factors slowing or prohibiting the expenditure of these funds at the state level.

Program improvement takes up approximately one-half of a full-time equivalent (FTE) state Chapter 1 staff person supported by Chapter 1 state administrative funds.

The philosophy of the Washington state SEA is to encourage LEAs to design programs based on the individual needs of students, resulting in services, instruction, and models that may vary from school to school, student to student, and grade level to grade level.

Monitoring, technical assistance to schools not in program improvement, attention to program development, and parent involvement are the primary areas that have been reduced as the result of increased attention to program improvement.

Increasing Capacity for School Improvement

In Washington state, four staff members administer and implement the Chapter 1 program in 300 LEAs. This staff is also responsible for the state-funded Learning Assistance Program (300 LEAs), which is similar in nature to Chapter 1, as well as the Chapter 1 Neglected or Delinquent Program (40 programs) and the Even Start Program. The expertise and knowledge required by the staff is extensive and includes rules and regulations, curriculum, current and effective practices, other special program requirements, basic education requirements, local district operations, accounting practices, and state legislative demands. With the current funding, the SEA staff is hard pressed to keep up with all the regular demands, let alone program improvement.

LEAs are not receiving all the guidance or assistance they should have from the SEA in order to do a high-quality job in program improvement. Much more assistance could be provided with developing desired outcomes and plans that are meaningful, but most importantly, with establishing the goals of program improvement to turn it into a positive experience for all.

The development of joint plans with districts will demand even more time and expertise. The TAC and RTAC have been extremely helpful in every phase of program improvement, and the consultant training that the state is doing should also help. However, there are still areas beyond this assistance that only the SEA can offer.

Substantial additional resources are needed to successfully perform all of these statewide responsibilities and continue improving the quality of Chapter 1 services. It would be helpful if program improvement funds could be used to support the additional responsibilities that program improvement has placed on state staff. The COP as well as LEA staff have requested that the state be able to use program improvement funds for statewide activities.

Additional Chapter 1 Innovation and Reform

Schoolwide Projects

Number of schoolwide projects in Washington by school year:

1989-90:	3
1990-91:	3
1991-92:	3

In the 1990-91 school year there were forty-three schools eligible for schoolwide projects. The SEA has encouraged the development and implementation of schoolwide projects through spring and fall applications and technical assistance workshops held throughout the state. These workshops involve extensive discussion and clarification about all of the service models and options that are available to program managers. A more recent approach includes the identification of eligible sites from current applications. Identified LEAs are notified of their potential to be a schoolwide project and asked about their interest and intent to participate. Districts indicating a desire to develop a schoolwide project are given assistance throughout the planning process by either the TAC, RTAC, or the SEA staff. Other activities that encourage schoolwide projects include a tri-state conference for interested districts and special agenda items at various meetings.

In addition, technical assistance is available on an ongoing basis to all sites conducting schoolwide projects. As part of the program responsibilities of the SEA, each schoolwide project is scheduled for a site visit during the early part of implementation. At this and each subsequent visit, specific activities such as the systematic consultation, evaluation, and maintenance of effort are reviewed and modifications are made, if appropriate.

The amount and extent of curricular, instructional, and organizational changes that have taken place in the schoolwide projects varies with the individual programs. Several of the projects are implementing extensive computer-assisted instruction and management programs, along with a staff development and training component. Another site emphasizes strong peer tutoring and a curriculum that accommodates cooperative learning.

All schools have, at least to some degree, reduced class sizes which enabled them to provide more enrichment activities and individualized instruction.

The SEA estimates that the following number of schools would be eligible for schoolwide projects if the low-income eligibility threshold were lowered from 75 percent to the following levels: 125 schools at 60 percent, 229 schools at 50 percent, and 405 schools at 40 percent.

Coordination with the Regular Classroom

Over the past several years, there has been a strong movement in the LEAs to provide services in the regular classroom. Local control has been the philosophy of the SEA, allowing LEAs to determine the services, materials, models, and staff that they believe will best meet the needs of Chapter 1 children. The SEA's focus, then, has been on instructional coordination rather than location, thereby resulting in consistent services to students. The SEA stresses the importance of sharing the responsibility for Chapter 1 students between Chapter 1 and regular staff.

LEAs in Washington State have made coordination a prime focus in delivery of services to students. Whenever SEA staff provide workshops, materials, technical assistance, guidance, and presentations, the concept of coordination and collaboration is stressed.

The majority of program improvement plans center around coordination activities such as providing mutual planning time to coordinate instruction, in-service for Chapter 1 and basic education staff, and curriculum alignment. There has been a strong emphasis at all levels in Washington for coordination between special programs and the regular classrooms. Program improvement has provided schools the opportunity to revisit this area. Many districts are implementing various forms of a classroom model; however, the bulk of coordination activity is directed toward the coordination of instruction.

There is not a consistent statewide effort in either teacher preparation or in-service training to help Chapter 1 and regular staff assist Chapter 1 children in their education. It is mostly through local staff that training has been given. The SEA would like to provide assistance in this area, if funds become available.

Statewide Coordination

The Washington State legislature mandates that districts conduct a self-study every seven years. This requirement includes all areas in every school, culminating in plans of action for school improvement. The SEA encourages LEAs to conduct program improvement-type activities in their self-study, if they are timely and feasible.

Washington has also funded the Learning Assistance Program (LAP), a similar program to Chapter 1. The program is administered by the same staff that administers the Chapter 1 program. Starting with the 1992-93 school year, LEAs will apply for Chapter 1 and LAP in the same application. The monitoring standards are on one form, and LEAs are reviewed for these programs at the same time. All forms, direction and guidance, monitoring, and assistance provided to LEAs are the same. Almost every area of LAP is the same as in Chapter 1.

There are some state barriers, however. LAP serves only grades K-9, and is strictly a public school program. Many LEAs have requested that the state legislature expand the program. LAP funding, is based on current data, which causes funding to fluctuate throughout the year. There are two federal hindrances to coordinating the two programs:

- Time and effort requirement. Because of the similarity to Chapter 1, many districts are forced to follow the federal time and effort requirements, which are perceived as quite restrictive.
- Non-instructional duties. The regulations now state that staff can only perform non-instructional duties when they are fully funded by Chapter 1. This stipulation is a problem for school staff when attempting to coordinate special programs.

Over the past several years, activities such as the consolidation of the federal Chapter 1 program and the LAP application process has significantly decreased the amount of duplication that would otherwise be necessary. Application preparation time on the part of the LEAs in terms of training (concurrent application workshops), the completion of similar forms, and adjustments and response time from the SEA has decreased. Starting with the 1992-93 school year, LEAs will be able to apply for Chapter 1 and LAP funds using a computerized application process. Another activity that has decreased duplication is merging the program review standards into one document that applies to both programs. It has been found that, in many instances, program requirements are applicable to either program and can be dealt with during a single program review. The responses to certain program compliance issues can be dealt with in the same manner.

Other items that are in the planning stages include the consolidation of various program assurances and the development of a three-year application process. The SEA is also beginning rural consortia around the state to assist rural LEAs streamline paperwork and share expertise.

The SEA has spent time with local directors indicating the national direction towards preschool and primary services, as well as the coordination with regional Head Start programs. There are several LEAs interested in early childhood programs; however, it is an LEA's decision as to where the funds will be focused . Other LEAs are beginning to implement developmentally appropriate curriculum, both in the regular program and in Chapter 1.

The SEA is also developing and implementing a program to provide coordinated, comprehensive services in such areas as health, nutrition, social services, employment, and housing to Chapter 1 families. This program would fund a person who would broker such services for the family, and enable the family to reach academic goals by taking away potential barriers. This project will focus on the early years—preschool to primary grades—although other grades may be served as well.

Limited-English-proficient (LEP) students may be served in Chapter 1 if they qualify on the Chapter 1 selection criteria developed by the LEA and if their needs do not stem from a language deficit. This is a complex issue for LEAs, as it is often difficult to determine whether the student is not reading because of the language deficit or a reading problem. It is also difficult because appropriate and accurate testing is not available to assist educators. Many times, staff make eligibility decisions based solely on their professional judgment.

For nearly ten years, LEAs in Washington state have been attempting to address the high percentage of children served by special education who have mild disabilities with characteristics similar to Chapter 1 children. This has resulted in many LEAs designing blended models, which provide instruction to children according to similar needs and staff expertise. Groups of children may include Chapter 1, LAP, migrant education, special education, and LEP-qualified children as well as other students that may need assistance yet do not qualify for a special program. There are a variety of models used which LEAs de-

sign based on the particular population and needs. The SEA, in conjunction with LEAs, has developed documents to assist LEAs interested in blending. The SEA, LEAs, and the State Auditor's Office have created a time and effort document to help districts know how to legally commingle or multi-fund staff. If a child is assessed as needing special education, yet also qualifies on the Chapter 1 selection criteria, the LEAs are permitted to serve special education students in Chapter 1.

Making a Difference School by School

Schoolwide Project at Palisades Elementary School, Palisades

Palisades Elementary School is a small, rural school that employs three full-time teachers and two instructional assistants. Palisades's student enrollment consists of 44 students in grades K-5. All are in combination classrooms of two or three grade levels. The low-income level is at 75 percent. Previously, Palisades used the pull-out model for the special compensatory programs.

The primary effect of the schoolwide project has been to reorganize the staffing pattern and provide services in the regular classrooms. Class sizes have decreased, individualized instruction has increased, and enrichment activities have been enhanced. Peer tutoring and cooperative learning are strong components of the project.

Curriculum and multi-cultural workshops were provided to the entire staff to enhance the ability of the school to meet the unique and individual needs of student enrollment. In addition, when hiring new teachers, the district makes a special attempt to employ those who have a strong background in teaching reading, are bilingual, and who have training in the processes of bilingual education.

Program Improvement at McCarver Elementary, Tacoma

The initial reaction of the Chapter 1 staff at McCarver to finding themselves in program improvement was not positive. They were anxious, worried, and even a little defensive. Their first thought was, "We have a good program, and it's not our fault that our students didn't do well on a standardized test!"

It was the support of the Chapter 1 Central Leadership Team and the Chapter 1 program improvement grant process offered through the state that started the school in the right direction. The grant form itself offered a structure that helped the school design a plan that included procedures for planning, implementation, and evaluation. Release time for classroom teachers to plan for program improvement brought together parents, teachers, and administrators and helped make program improvement a whole school concern. Because of this planning, the school began this year with a framework in place and a commitment from parents, teachers and administrators to implement the improvements jointly agreed upon.

This school year, the school is finding that program improvement is having a significant impact on the entire program. The staff members have substantially increased their involvement with parents and children and established an atmosphere that promotes a heightened sense of trust and greater communication between home and school. Through both the grant and the school district's Chapter 1 funds, staff development opportunities are helping the staff grow professionally and have contributed to a sense of working together that goes beyond simply coordinating the Chapter 1 program with the basic education program.

The experience with program improvement this year has given a sense of empowerment to McCarver's parents, classroom teachers, and Chapter 1 staff. Working together, everyone can make a difference for the students.

West Virginia

Chapter 1 Participation and Funding Summary

Participation Levels in School Year (SY) 1990-91

Number of Children Served:	36,433
Percentage of K-12 Children Served:	11%
Number and Percentage of School Districts Receiving Chapter 1 Assistance:	55; 100%
Number and Percentage of Schools Receiving Chapter 1 Assistance:	558; 56%

Chapter 1 Services by Grade Span in SY 1990-91

Preschool	0%
Kindergarten	1%
Grades 1-3	46%
Grades 4-6	41%
Grades 7-12	12%

State Funding Levels by School Year

Formula Grants Allocation SY 1990-91, 1991-92:	$43,037,845; $46,405,982
Formula Grants Allocation SY 1992-93:	$53,737,090
Chapter 1 Per Pupil Expenditure SY 1990-91:	$3,789
Program Improvement Allocation SY 1991-92, 1992-93:	$110,299; $193,286

Chapter 1 Program Improvement Summary

Number of Schools in Program Improvement in SY 1991-92

Total Number of Schools in Program Improvement:	151
Percentage of Chapter 1 Schools in Program Improvement:	27%
Number of Schools in Joint Planning:	47

Statewide Minimum Standards for Improvement–A normal curve equivalent (NCE) gain greater than two in both advanced and basic skills and substantial progress in achieving locally determined desired outcomes.

Chapter 1 Program Improvement

Statewide Technical Assistance

The state education education (SEA) encourages the use of other objective measures, in coordination with NCEs, that indicate progress within the school. The SEA strongly encourages local education agencies (LEAs) to develop high-standard desired outcomes that enhance the information provided by norm-referenced tests and other measures. The state staff provide technical assistance to Chapter 1 coordinators, teachers, and principals with developing desired outcomes.

Once identified for improvement, schools are encouraged to attend regional meetings conducted by the SEA to introduce the school program improvement plan and process. The principal, Chapter 1 teacher, and chairman of each school faculty or school improvement team are strongly urged to attend.

SEA staff, Chapter 1, and curriculum specialists are also available to work with each school upon request. During the review of each school staff's plan for improvement, the SEA staff members suggest ways to strengthen the program and enhance awareness of the various types of in-service, college courses, or National Diffusion Network program (NDN) programs that may meet their needs. The SEA is also developing a collaborative in-service program that emphasizes the purpose of Chapter 1, the Better Schools Study, and state and national goals.

The SEA has worked hard with local directors, principals, and teachers to reduce the negative association of being identified as needing program improvement. Through regional workshops and work with individual schools, the SEA has taken the approach: "Your school has been identified. Let's find out why, and what you can do to improve." The SEA assures each school identified that the information will not be made public. The SEA also combined the monitoring process with program improvement to alleviate the stress involved with identification.

Models of curriculum and instructional strategies in West Virginia are as wide and varied as the schools themselves. Emphasis is placed on coordination of programs, advanced skills, and parental involvement.

Program improvement has shifted the focus of the monitoring process from compliance issues, which are now evaluated during administrative review, to the instructional activities of Chapter 1. To allow SEA staff more time to devote to program improvement, local Chapter 1 Directors have been recruited to serve on monitoring teams. The SEA is in the process of revising the Chapter 1 application and handbook, which will call for additional emphasis on program improvement and program development.

Exiting Program Improvement

The SEA strongly encourages schools to continue in program improvement even after testing out. Once school staff become involved in assessing needs, developing programs, and training, it is counterproductive to stop progress prematurely. The carry-over benefits of the staff involvement in the identification of problems and the development of plans to improve the school leads to better instruction for students and a smaller chance the school will be identified the next year.

Joint SEA/LEA Plans

At the present time, all improvement projects are joint projects to some degree. In response to requests on the part of LEA Chapter 1 directors and with the sanction of the Committee of Practitioners, the state office must approve all plans. As a result, all plans are scrutinized by the state office, and decisions are made on the potential effectiveness of the plans, after which changes are negotiated as appropriate.

Every school identified for a joint project is given the option of receiving technical assistance from the SEA. Local directors are also notified of schools needing joint plans and are requested to assist these schools with their plans and to provide them with additional funds from the basic Chapter 1 allocation. SEA curriculum specialists also work with the schools. Priority in awarding program improvement grants is given to joint projects.

Funding for Program Improvement

Eighty-nine percent of the 1990-91 program improvement funds have been distributed as of this time. The first year these funds were available, many LEAs chose to use surplus funds from the basic grant, which they had to spend to get under the 15 percent carry-over provisions.

All of the improvement funds have been allocated directly to each school requesting them. No funds have been spent for direct SEA assistance.

Increasing Capacity for School Improvement

Although a number of instructional areas are in great need of additional program improvement resources, the most important of these is staff development. Personnel in the LEAs are limited, both in numbers and expertise, yet the SEA relies on them for assessing the needs and designs of corrective measures. Although very capable people work within the school system, frequently there is little exposure to new and innovative practices. Only with a comprehensive staff development program, that focuses on instructional strategies and parental support, can more effective and creative decisions be made at the school level.

gional meeting, the SEA staff members emphasize the advantages of schoolwide projects. When SEA staff work with a local director on school selection and program development, the possibility of beginning a schoolwide project is thoroughly investigated in terms of requirements, cost, and staff acceptability.

A few schoolwide projects have adopted, with the aid of local input, the Success for All model. The majority of curricular and instructional changes have been fairly typical, such as reducing class size in the 1st and 2nd grade, improving coordination, and providing extended-day programs. The SEA encourages these programs to use the findings of the Better School Study and to teach more advanced skills.

Program improvement has shifted the focus of the monitoring process from compliance issues, which are now evaluated during administrative review, to the instructional activities of Chapter 1.

Program improvement in a school goes beyond the Chapter 1 program. If services to Chapter 1 students are to be adequate, the entire school experience must also have both of these qualities. West Virginia is currently moving toward an outcome-based educational program. It is imperative that Chapter 1 be given support to develop outcomes and corresponding instruction to ensure consistent services to all students.

Additional Chapter 1 Innovation and Reform

Schoolwide Projects

Number of schoolwide projects in West Virginia by school year:

1989-90	3
1990-91	15
1991-92	23

Fifty four schools were eligible for schoolwide projects in 1990-91. The SEA staff has actively encouraged local districts to begin schoolwide projects in all eligible schools. At each state and re-

The SEA makes the following projections of the number of schools in the state that would be eligible for schoolwide projects if the 75 percent low-income eligibility threshold were reduced to the following levels: 210 schools at 60 percent, 382 schools at 50 percent, and 544 schools at 40 percent.

Coordination with the Regular Classroom

At every state, regional, and in-service meeting, the SEA staff stresses the importance of coordinating programs in the regular classroom. The LEAs must describe in their Chapter 1 application how schools in their district will coordinate curriculum and instruction between the regular classroom and the Chapter 1 program. When SEA staff visit schools to monitor Chapter 1 programs, classroom teachers and Chapter 1 staff are specifically asked about the extent to which they coordinate. In a self-assess-

ment questionnaire, the entire staff of every school identified for program improvement must answer a set of questions about coordination.

Statewide Coordination

The West Virginia Department of Education combined the Chapter 1 office and the curriculum specialist into a new Office of Instruction. This new alignment should lead to greater coordination of programs at the state level.

The SEA Chapter 1 staff has encouraged coordination of the school program improvement process with other state and local improvement plans. The major difference in plans is the performance measurement. Most state and local plans use data from the end-of-the-year norm-referenced test (NRT) and Chapter 1 relies on pre- and post-test results from an NRT. Some LEAs have begun to adopt the Chapter 1 self-assessment for program improvement with their plans. This rating scale is based on items from the school effectiveness model and is coordinated with state and national goals.

Although there is no formal coordination with other federal programs, such as Chapter 2, the Chapter 1 office has coordinated efforts between Chapter 1, Chapter 2, and Title II in combining federal and local funds to provide summer training programs for teachers. These programs were a direct result of the Chapter 1 school program improvement plans designed in those counties.

The Chapter 1 office is in the process of revising its application to cut back the procedures for program development and approval. Routing of documents and data has been streamlined to save time. LEAs are also encouraged to evaluate their programs with the state/county testing program to eliminate the need to give another Chapter 1 test. All test data information will be available by computer, which will generate all required test information on a state level.

Head Start and Chapter 1 in West Virginia are beginning to work together. Many Head Start programs are now located in schools. Any school that houses Head Start and submits a program for schoolwide projects is encouraged to make Head Start an integral part of the total program.

SEA staff members also attend state and regional Head Start meetings. The SEA invites Head Start officials to attend Chapter 1 meetings on Even Start, preschool, and early childhood programs.

LEAs have been encouraged to use Chapter 1 funds for preschool and early childhood education programs. Some LEAs have extended-day kindergarten preschool sessions and programs to work with parents of preschoolers in the home.

The Chapter 1 and special education staff have worked together on a state level to coordinate services for mildly impaired students. Discussions center around selection and coordination of services.

Wisconsin

Chapter 1 Participation and Funding Summary

Participation Levels in School Year (SY) 1990-91

Number of Children Served:	69,602
Percentage of K-12 Children Served:	7%
Number and Percentage of School Districts Receiving Chapter 1 Assistance:	422; 99%
Number and Percentage of Schools Receiving Chapter 1 Assistance:	1,379; 69%

Chapter 1 Services by Grade Span in SY 1990-91

Preschool	4%
Kindergarten	10%
Grades 1-3	43%
Grades 4-6	24%
Grades 7-12	19%

State Funding Levels by School Year

Formula Grants Allocation SY 1990-91, 1991-92:	$68,076,535; $80,546,195
Formula Grants Allocation SY 1992-93:	$87,403,318
Chapter 1 Per Pupil Expenditure SY 1990-91:	$1,167
Program Improvement Allocation SY 1991-92, 1992-93:	$197,331; $323,789

Chapter 1 Program Improvement Summary

Number of Schools in Program Improvement in SY 1991-92

Total Number of Schools in Program Improvement:	350
Percentage of Chapter 1 Schools in Program Improvement:	25%
Number of Schools in Joint Planning:	21

Statewide Minimum Standards for Improvement-At least three normal curve equivalents (NCEs) or greater in basic and advanced skills for grades 2-12 programs and substantial progress by at least 80 percent of students in achieving at least one desired outcome in both basic and advanced skills not measured by a standardized test; also assessment of early childhood programs by locally determined desired outcomes that are not based on standardized tests.

Chapter 1 Program Improvement

Leveraging Accountability and Higher Performance

The state education agency (SEA) believes that the establishment of the broadly based building team to review assessment profiles and program needs and to plan coordinated action is one of the greatest benefits of the mandated program improvement legislation. The school improvement focus promotes site-based coordination, enabling Chapter 1 and the other district programs to support school team planning. This focus prevents Chapter 1 from floundering in isolation, and students are the beneficiaries.

Some schools that are not statistically eligible for program improvement have nominated themselves for participation in the process. The Chapter 1 program has showcased some of these schools at state meetings.

Since the first year of implementation, the statewide minimum standard has increased by three NCEs and the SEA continues to encourage its LEAs to set higher standards than the state's. The SEA also encourages LEAs to establish other effective desired outcomes for selected components and/or grade levels and to establish local definitions of substantial progress. Non-test and non-standardized measures may be employed; for example, improved secondary program attendance rates, and improved drop-out rates.

The Committee of Practitioners (COP) initially recommended lower statewide standards and letting LEAs set the standards rather than the state. The COP did not support the SEA as the entity that should define "substantial progress." The COP recommended that the SEA encourage but not require "other desired outcomes" and that the SEA let the LEA define these outcomes. The Committee has recommended continued exploration of the use of assessment alternatives other than standardized tests to determine school program improvement needs.

Statewide Technical Assistance

The state-sponsored staff development offered over the past two years has included many opportunities for local coordinators, evaluators, and other key project personnel to be fully apprised of how to develop desired outcomes effectively and employ non-standardized tests. Assistance has included workshops, technical assistance visits to districts, development and dissemination of relevant materials, and technical assistance center (TAC) human and material resources. Particular emphasis has been given to ensuring that the desired outcomes are appropriately developed to encompass both basic and advanced skills.

The state emphasizes school team planning in the special workshops de-

signed and carried out annually for teams from schools identified for program improvement. Program improvement induction workshops are held on a regional basis and other workshops are conducted in the larger urban area school districts. State and TAC staff provide intensive training in: assessing needs to build consensus; writing the formal action plan; preparing timelines; accessing program improvement funds; and understanding assessment techniques, requirements, and alternative models for delivery of services. Selected schools receive on-site technical assistance visits throughout the year from state staff and TAC consultants. The state Chapter 1 evaluator, consultants, and administrator also provide extensive technical assistance by phone and through written correspondence. Periodic SEA communications review the phases of program improvement and remind local project staff that attention must be directed to the established program improvement processes.

SEA consultants carefully plan their district visits and workshop activities to model and promote program improvement strategies. The consultants coordinate on-site Chapter 1 monitoring and compliance visits with a review of Chapter 1 program improvement implementation. The state monitoring report includes status reports on program improvement progress. On-site visits include a question-and-answer session on program improvement at the building and student levels.

In order to reduce the potential negative association at the local level accompanying identification of schools for program improvement or the initiation of joint plans, the SEA has disseminated information to school boards, district administrators, parent councils, and principals about Chapter 1. State staff members participated in workshops of organizations such as the state mathematics and reading associations to discuss the purposes of program improvement; and the state administrator and TAC resource consultant conducted an information session for school board members and district administrators at the annual school boards convention. The state staff has also worked closely with the association of local Chapter 1 directors to promote understanding of the purposes and expectations of the program improvement legislation. In addition, a strong partnership with the Cooperative Educational Services Agency has strengthened the program improvement efforts in districts contracting with them for Chapter 1 administration and program support services.

At several regional workshops in 1990-91 and 1991-92, participating teams from identified buildings were advised of the fallacy that program improvement is limited to looking only at Chapter 1. The teams left with an understanding of how their broadly based, site-management team would need to focus on the total school program and the role and function of Chapter 1 as an integral part of school improvement and student achievement. The SEA finds the strong emphasis on involving site-based personnel, including the principal leadership, is helping to break down the negative reactions that first occur when a building is identified.

The SEA has promoted networking and sharing between personnel from schools that were successful in program improvement and personnel from newly identified schools. SEA consultants assigned to a joint plan school take the responsibility to provide leadership when negative attitudes initially prohibit positive movement toward a defined program improvement plan.

Successful Models

Specific portions of the state's staff development sessions over the past two years for coordinators, evaluators, and teachers in ongoing renewal workshops have included substantial content on the development of advanced skills and the examination of successful alternative delivery models. Extensive materials on these topics have been disseminated to all Chapter 1 projects. State staff specializing in early childhood, mathematics, reading, language arts, elementary and secondary education, and evaluation and assessment have coordinated their workshop planning, the development of materials, and selection of relevant research for the training provided to local Chapter 1 project personnel. Statewide technical assistance helps local Chapter 1 personnel in their efforts to guide project planning and the development of program designs that reflect knowledge and understanding of the curriculum directions supported by current research. These efforts have been effective in discouraging the repetition of existing practice simply because it has been done for a number of years. Initially, standard program models are in operation, but as the state and local consultants persist, creative approaches are adopted.

SEA consultation staff has reported that program improvement planning is being used in some of the school buildings to: train staff, implement the National Mathematics Standards; implement reading strategies, use team planning for more integrated curriculum efforts, plan for use and implementation of in-classroom and combined models, promote advanced learning and skill retention, encourage cooperative learning, emphasize the importance of developmentally appropriate early childhood programs, and push for curricular reform at the local level.

Exiting Program Improvement

There were 157 schools identified for Chapter 1 program improvement based on the 1989-90 testing cycle. Sixty-five (41 percent) of the 157 schools identified tested out of program improvement before fully implementing their plans.

The SEA encourages schools to proceed with their plans even when they have tested out in order to take advantage of all or at least parts of the professional school team examination of achievement, the total school environ-

ment, and the relationship of district and Chapter 1 program activities. The SEA attributes a significant amount of improved achievement in schools testing out to school team needs analysis and at least partial implementation of their program improvement plans.

Joint SEA/LEA Plans

The SEA has a formal, joint planning process in place. Currently, the education consultants have the responsibility to guide any targeted school in their assigned areas. The consultant makes contact with all schools required to be in joint planning to ensure that one of the three joint plan options is selected. Telephone contacts, written communications and on-site visits are all employed throughout the year to monitor the school's progress. The SEA consultant recommends resource personnel for a school to consider in meeting special identified needs and also arranges for access to and utilization of TAC human and material resources to enhance the school's progress in meeting the agreed-upon joint planning activities.

SEA consultants are funded under state administration funds. The local schools in joint planning may apply for a grant available from program improvement funds. Five schools were in joint plans for 1990-91, and three schools were successful in improving their performance enough to meet the local and state standards.

The degree of effort and genuine search for improvement by the site-based teams and the ongoing upgrading of the program improvement plans appear to be the deciding factors for successful programs.

Funding for Program Improvement

The SEA has distributed all of the program improvement funds for 1990-91 and 1991-92. The amount of requests from identified schools was double the amount of available funds. Therefore, a considerable amount of time was spent in cutting from amounts requested and prorating. All of the program improvement funds are allocated to LEAs to support local program improvement plan activities and participation in staff development.

The Chapter 1 state administration staff devotes 45 percent of its time to program improvement. The SEA is recruiting a full-time consultant who will be devoted to following up on joint plans, organizing the state's program improvement data base, addressing staff development needs, and organizing program improvement activities in urban schools. All program improvement technical assistance from the SEA is funded from state administrative funds.

Due to the extensive time required for program improvement activities, the state administrator has cut back on presentations to state parent groups. Consultants with high numbers of assigned schools in program improvement have had to decrease the number of compliance and technical assistance visits to districts not in program improvement, but that are scheduled for on-site review. Monitoring reports are written at nights and on weekends so necessary contacts for program improvement can be made during the day.

The state evaluator has had to limit the scope of reports on evaluation results due to the extensive amount of time needed for organization and analysis of program improvement data, participation in statewide program improvement induction workshops, and the provision of ongoing technical assistance. The demand placed on the one Chapter 1 evaluator makes it difficult to meet federal timelines for regular evaluation program reporting.

Increasing Capacity for School Improvement

The SEA desperately needs more full time staff at an educational consultant level with expertise in curriculum development, evaluation, assessment, and the implementation of a state program improvement data base. Monitoring the status of program improvement at the building level is resulting in multiple layers of information to be processed. The assistance sought will enable a more continuous focus on key areas of program improvement that need attention if the state is to achieve maximum success and realize the full benefits of the program improvement legislation. If additional funds were available, the SEA would use them for the following purposes: integration of LEA and SEA Chapter 1 program improvement data, applied research of alternative assessment processes for Chapter 1 program improvement, provision of more extensive site-based school team planning; and more extensive training to local teams on strategies for building stronger parental support systems.

Additional Chapter 1 Innovation and Reform

Schoolwide Projects

Number of schoolwide projects in Wisconsin over the last three school years:

1989-90	9
1990-91	15
1991-92	20

According to the State Department of Education, the number of schools eligible for schoolwide projects in 1990-91 was thirty-four.

The SEA provides all districts with the schoolwide project packet of information and consults with schools that qualify for schoolwide project status. Applications, instructions, and technical assistance also are made available to eligible schools. Districts are encouraged to require these schools to spend a year planning for substantial school improvement rather than participating immediately.

The SEA conducts workshops annually to provide technical assistance to schools in schoolwide projects and those considering a project for the following year. Individual consultation has been provided by SEA staff to interested districts and schools.

Successful outcomes of schoolwide projects to date include local staff development in cooperative learning techniques, effective reading and

mathematics curricula, content area strategies, and team planning and teaching. More focus on teaching advanced skills is beginning to emerge.

It appears at this time that there is a potential for 75 percent of the twenty approved schoolwide projects to have problems meeting the program improvement requirements of the law. When there is an absence of districtwide testing at all grade levels, there are many problems with the options for assessing at the end of the third year. Comparison to the three previous years is almost impossible because advanced skills were not previously pulled out.

The SEA makes the following estimates of the number of schools that would be eligible for schoolwide projects if the low-income eligibility threshold were reduced from 75 percent to the following levels: 48 schools at 60 percent, 111 schools at 50 percent, and 190 schools at 40 percent.

Coordination with the Regular Classroom

The SEA has disseminated information on effective classroom models. In-service workshops have afforded opportunities for discussion of the strategies for team teaching with a focus on coordination between regular classrooms and Chapter 1 teachers. The SEA has also held workshops designed to promote Chapter 1 teacher and aide coordination.

For the past two years, the SEA has conducted teacher renewal workshops that permit teams comprised of the Chapter 1 and classroom teachers to be updated on current research and instructional strategies for teaching of reading/language arts, mathematics, and early childhood education. The team returns to train others at their respective grade level. Local Chapter 1 coordinators have attested to the success of this approach which has proven effective in strengthening instruction and facilitating greater coordination for both Chapter 1 and regular classrooms.

The SEA consultants pay close attention to the coordination of services when monitoring local projects and offer recommendations or require action to improve these as appropriate. Positive action to improve coordination at local project sites has been observed in models where Chapter 1 staff take a full day each week to meet with regular teachers and special services personnel. Chapter 1 staff has also sponsored after-school parent/family activities that all families in the building are invited to attend. Schoolwide thematic units have been coordinated by Chapter 1 and encompassed the entire building and community. A number of districtwide program improvement efforts are being undertaken because Chapter 1 schools have been so successful.

Statewide Coordination

The knowledge gained from early entry of Chapter 1 into substantial building-level program improvement efforts across the state should be useful as the state moves to adopt a state-sponsored school improvement program in 1992-93. If the state-sponsored program improvement plan with a site-based school emphasis as proposed is approved, efforts to coordinate and integrate Chapter 1 program improvement with this new effort would be of paramount importance and will be pursued.

Coordinators of Chapter 1 and Chapter 2 programs at the SEA share information and have worked to coordinate positions on services to eligible private school students but not specific Chapter 1 program improvement initiatives. All SEA staff encourage local coordination of resources for programs and services, which may include local program improvement initiatives.

The state has a compensatory program (P-5) that funds programs in three urban districts. The state has worked with districts to include coordination with Chapter 1 in their planning. In some instances, the schoolwide effectiveness plans delineate the role and function of each. Chapter 1 schoolwide projects are described in these school effectiveness plans to avoid duplication. Coordination in the preparation of applications has reduced paperwork. The application process has been consolidated for the largest urban area. Different SEA units handle the P-5 and Chapter 1 programs but collaboration and planning has enabled substantial progress to be made in achieving effective coordination.

The SEA provides information to LEAs on the importance of early childhood education programs and what constitutes quality programming. The SEA provides technical assistance to districts in planning, designing, and evaluating these programs. The districts, through use of broadly based needs assessment committees, are expected to examine the local data to determine grade levels to be served and instructional priorities. The SEA does not require or dictate what grade levels are to be served for eligible attendance areas, but documentation of the needs assessment process must be available at the local level to support program placement. If services already exist to meet a local need, duplication of effort is avoided. The SEA has encouraged LEAs for several years to consider the efficacy of coordination of Chapter 1 and local Head Start programs. The SEA believes inter-face models can be developed.

Wisconsin has a mandated bilingual education program. The SEA has promoted coordination of Chapter 1 bilingual and special education services through joint planning by consultants from these programs in workshop presentations and in joint monitoring visits to districts with bilingual, Chapter 1, and Chapter 1 migrant programs. Materials are shared by each consultant for use in the other programs. The state Chapter 1 program conducted a statewide Early Childhood Conference in March 1992 with the Bureau for Exceptional Educational Needs. There is much more work to be done in the state to resolve barriers that prevent coordinated services, but overall a good start has been made.

The SEA Chapter 1 program follows the federal regulations in requesting that limited-English-proficient (LEP) children be selected on the basis of academic needs and not on the basis of the English-language development need. An extensive exchange of information takes place between the bilingual education consultant and the Chapter 1 consultants to enable appropriate technical assistance to be provided to those instructing disadvantaged LEP pupils who qualify for both services. Coordination and collaboration efforts are progressing at the state level to address this need.

Guidance is provided to Chapter 1 projects related to needs assessment and selection procedures that allows pupils to be served who qualify for special education and Chapter 1 services on the basis of academic needs and not on the basis of the identified special education need. There is more work to be done to ensure that local project personnel are clear on the procedures that permit children access to both services.

Making a Difference School by School

Schoolwide Project at Clarke Street School, Milwaukee

This is the second year of the school's involvement as a Chapter 1 schoolwide project. The school provides instruction to students in kindergarten through grade 5. There are two half-day kindergarten classes for four-year-olds, four kindergarten classes for five-year-olds, and High Scope programs serving 150 children. There are two exceptional education classes for educable mentally retarded children and two classes for the academically talented in grades 2 and 3 and grades 4 and 5. While the schoolwide Chapter 1 project serves the entire school population, pupils in the 39th percentile and below are identified for the most intense service.

The Clarke Street School is situated in a high-poverty area with a mobility rate of 45 percent. Free breakfast and lunch are served to 96 percent of the students.

Rationale for Change

The school was dissatisfied with the minimal achievement gains that were resulting from the pull-out Chapter 1 project. An approach was sought that would support the school's strong commitment to the premise that all children can learn.

As a school-based management school operating a state-funded compensatory education program as well as Chapter 1 program, the planning team elected to take a full year to plan the strategies that would permit effective linkages of the federal- and state-funded program entities and a business partnership with GE Medical Systems of Milwaukee. The coordinated P-5, Chapter 1, and Site-Based Management Planning is embodied in the annual School Effectiveness Plan submitted to the SEA.

Clarke Street parents and teachers elected to pursue a Chapter 1 schoolwide project approach to enable the following: more students at or below the 39th percentile to receive more services in math and reading, teachers to work as a team throughout the building with heterogeneous as well as homogenous grouping, teachers to work in teams to effectively diagnose the needs of all students, additional computers to be placed in the school to provide daily opportunities for all students to enhance or enrich their math and reading skills, and more parent involvement to help enhance student achievement and social skills.

A special feature built into the Clarke Street School project was to employ additional staff to focus on high-priority needs and support the school's instructional staff. The following positions were added: program implementor, math coordinator, reading resource teacher, and science educational assistants.

The combined efforts of the additional teachers and new professionals complemented the classroom teachers. The schoolwide project plan also included employment of paraprofessionals to assist classroom teachers as part of the team instructional approach.

A number of districtwide program improvement efforts are being undertaken because Chapter 1 schools have been so successful.

Operational Plan

The classes of twenty-five students are divided and rotated in groups to receive direct instruction in basic and advanced skills and to experience reinforcement and remediation. The reading resource teacher, the math implementor, the program implementor,and parents also provide one-to-one instruction on a short-term basis. The business partnership with GE Medical Systems resulted in receipt of funding to furnish a science laboratory for hands-on science activities. The science implementor position gave leadership to ensure teacher and pupil involvement in quality science curriculum experiences.

Results

Clarke Street School's achievement gains for 1991-92 met the state standard of three NCEs in reading and demonstrated four NCEs achievement gains in mathematics. Thus, Clarke Street School, which was in formal program improvement in 1990-91, exited on the basis of achievement gains when the annual review was conducted.

The SEA believes the Clarke Street experience has demonstrated the value of having a school site-based management team take a year for the development of a sound plan before plunging into the schoolwide project approach just because there is statistical eligibility to do so.

Another positive result was the involvement of parents as teachers. The parents shared information about their careers with students. This involvement of the parents in the educational process assisted children with learning.

Program Improvement at the Warrens School, Tomah

The Warrens school was targeted for school improvement for 1990-91 when the state standard of three NCEs was not met for basic skills and advanced skills in the integrated reading/language arts program component.

The building team attended and used the needs assessment processes outlined at the SEA program improvement training session to identify the needs foundation for the development of the action plan.

The Chapter 1 program established the following pupil desired outcomes: students in K-1 will increase their word analysis and comprehension skills as measured by data compiled in the students portfolio; 80 percent of the students in grades 2-6 will increase their comprehension skills by an average of five NCE gains as measured on a standardized test; parental involvement in sponsored activities will be increased, as will their involvement in their children's education; increased student self-esteem will be evident when individual oral surveys are conducted; and academic improvement will be noted in students' grades.

Operationally, the tasks and activities included: scheduled staff in-service on learning styles; monthly distribution of articles and faculty sharing of learning style ideas; quarterly staff in-service on higher order thinking skills, methods of practice and reteaching, instructional pacing and student monitoring, and instructional time on task; a flexible plan to promote more coordination between Chapter 1 staff and regular staff; planned home visits to six families each month to increase parental knowledge of and involvement in working with children in the home; and continued networking with and access to Tomah area school district's targeted Chapter 1 parent involvement plan.

The district received a program improvement mini-grant of $2,000 to assist with the purchase of materials for parental involvement and to strengthen staff development. Kits were developed for use in the home visits; speakers, trainers, and experts were brought in to facilitate in-service presentations; and parental training materials were purchased.

The Tomah Area School District used a portfolio approach to assess K-1 students' needs and progress. In September 1990, teachers gathered baseline data objectives taken from the Chapter 1 kindergarten goals, desired outcomes, and a language arts process for the 1st grade Chapter 1. Additional information was gathered during the year.

Chapter 1 teachers summarized the progress of each student by means of a pre- and post-continuum.

Results

The portfolio assessment indicated that goals were met at the building and district level in both basic and advanced skills for kindergarten and grade 1.

The Warrens School exited program improvement for the 1991-92 school year. All of the students reported improved self-esteem on individually administered oral surveys. Academic improvement was noted for many pupils. The Tomah school district also established aggregate achievement gains of five NCEs, which exceeded the state's reading/language arts program standards for grades 2-6.

Wyoming

Chapter 1 Participation and Funding Summary

Participation Levels in School Year (SY) 1990-91

Number of Children Served:	4,877
Percentage of K-12 Children Served:	5%
Number and Percentage of School Districts Receiving Chapter 1 Assistance:	45; 92%
Number and Percentage of Schools Receiving Chapter 1 Assistance:	121; 29%

Chapter 1 Services by Grade Span in SY 1990-91

Preschool	4%
Kindergarten	15%
Grades 1-3	38%
Grades 4-6	31%
Grades 7-12	12%

State Funding Levels by School Year

Formula Grants Allocation SY 1990-91, 1991-92:	$5,487,410; $6,347,103
Formula Grants Allocation SY 1992-93:	$7,627,565
Chapter 1 Per Pupil Expenditure SY 1990-91:	$1,125
Program Improvement Allocation SY 1991-92, 1992-93:	$90,000; $180,000

Chapter 1 Program Improvement

Number of Schools in Program Improvement in SY 1991-92

Total Number of Schools in Program Improvement:	20
Percentage of Chapter 1 Schools in Program Improvement:	17%
Number of Schools in Joint Planning:	5

Minimum Statewide Standards for Improvement-Greater than zero normal curve equivalent (NCE) gain and substantial progress in achieving locally determined desired outcomes.

Chapter 1 Program Improvement

Leveraging Accountability and Higher Performance

The Wyoming Department of Education believes that any school could benefit from examining its philosophy, goals, objectives, and teaching/learning strategies attendant to improvement. Chapter 1 program improvement is fostering this kind of rethinking. Despite the over-reliance on standardized tests to identify schools for program improvement, Chapter 1 has served as a model for school improvement in any number of schools.

The incidence of low-performing schools that avoid program improvement because of the need to make minimum NCE gains is small. A small number of schools may view the Chapter 1 program improvement process as an imposition, but most schools want to show improvement and welcome the opportunity to go through the process.

Statewide Technical Assistance

Through instructions and information dissemination, the state education agency (SEA) has encouraged and helped districts and schools establish locally determined desired outcomes in addition to NCE gains on norm-referenced tests. Despite the fact that the Committee of Practitioners (COP) has neither discouraged nor encouraged higher statewide standards, all of the schools identified for program improvement have established aggregate achievement objectives that exceed the state minimum.

Once identified for improvement, the Wyoming Department of Education provides schools with technical assistance in the form of consultation, information, and assistance. The Technical Assistance Center (TAC) is kept informed about these schools, and the schools are encouraged to contact the TAC for any general and/or specific information. An in-service meeting about program improvement sponsored jointly by the Department and TAC was held in March 1992. Currently, the Department is developing one-page program profiles on each project. The profiles will be made available to each school district.

Emphasis on the development of advanced skills and the adoption of successful models is accomplished through the TAC program and on-site monitoring. Further, encouragement has been effected through the official newsletter Chapter 1 Footprints and through dissemination efforts to acquaint schools with exemplary programs available from the National Diffusion Network (NDN). The current coordinator of the basic grants program is the former state facilitator for the NDN. The program profiles will serve to inform schools across the state about successful models in Wyoming schools. Last year, three Wyoming Chapter 1 programs were presented at the International Reading Association

meeting, and this year, two of those programs are again invited to exhibit at the meeting. Several schools have been encouraged to visit these model programs.

The SEA has also taken steps to reduce any potential negative association accompanying identification of schools for program improvement or the initiation of joint plans by keeping schools well-informed regarding the program's purposes, requirements, and available services. A series of regional meetings for Chapter 1 personnel is also carried out annually. Special mailings are made periodically regarding program improvement responsibilities. Most schools view the improvement procedure as a positive step.

Each Wyoming school district is participating in the implementation of performance-based education involving a cross-section of people from business, industry, and the community. The program seeks strong parental involvement as well. Curriculum, instructional strategies, assessment, and coordination among all school programs are being carefully considered. Chapter 1 schools are contributing to this process because performance has always been an integral part of the program, and in many schools, Chapter 1 serves as a model for performance-based instruction.

Chapter 1 teachers generally maintain excellent communication with regular classroom teachers. To bridge communications between the department and each local school district, SEA personnel are assigned as liaisons to clusters of school districts and are required to maintain dialogues with them. State Chapter 1 staff members participate in the liaison program.

The Wyoming Department of Education Chapter 1 staff carries out systematic monitoring to assess compliance requirements and program improvement progress. Each school is visited once every three years. Until this year, Chapter 1 received assistance in this effort during routine accreditation on-site reviews by teams from the SEA. This year, because schools were entering into the state performance-based education program, the Chapter 1 staff visited fourteen of the forty-five participating districts.

Exiting Program Improvement

The Wyoming Department of Education encourages schools that were identified for improvement to implement their plans fully and to continue in the program improvement process even if the schools test out. Encouragement is provided through education and information regarding the purposes of Chapter 1, advising service providers of program requirements, and keeping them apprised of the consequences of non-compliance with federal and state rules and regulations. The SEA encourages these schools to acquire technical assistance through agencies of their choice, including the SEA, TAC, university, and/or other local and national agencies.

Joint SEA/LEA Plans

Joint plans with local education agencies (LEAs) are reviewed in conjunction with the LEA. The SEA advises the TAC regarding these schools. If the plan is reasonably sound, the SEA advises the LEA that it concurs with the plan and recommends that the TAC or some other resource of the district's choice be contacted for further technical assistance. Statewide meetings also provide opportunities to assist schools with joint plans. Funds to support assistance with joint plans come from the Chapter 1 budget and include administrative and program improvement funds. While in-state travel has been curtailed by the governor's order, on-site visits to schools are regarded as the most appropriate opportunity to assist in program design. Joint plans developed thus far have resulted in student's showing positive gains at the end of the third year.

Funding for Program Improvement

All program improvement money is used for mini-grants. Schools identified for improvement may apply for up to $1,000 by submitting a request for funds. Requests for more than $1,000 must be reviewed by the COP. The necessity for Committe approval has been found to delay the expenditure of program funds.

The Wyoming Department of Education estimates that 20 percent of state administration staff time is devoted to Chapter 1 program improvement. Increased attention devoted to program improvement affects other Chapter 1 administrative activities. Planning, and conducting on-site monitoring, and developing information dissemination strategies suffer the most.

Increasing Capacity for School Improvement

With only two Chapter 1 program consultants at the state level, the state is limited in terms of the time and resources available to provide technical assistance in the establishment of outcome goals, testing, statewide performance data management, and joint program improvement projects. Central to the idea of more effective SEA program management and LEA participation in the decision process is the need for improved electronic data and communication linkages between the SEA and schools and among schools. While the SEA is already developing a comprehensive management system to accommodate agency needs, additional personnel and fiscal resources would be considered essential to any expansion in Chapter 1 services. Improved access to information and communications systems would allow Chapter 1 staff to participate more conveniently, frequently, and efficiently in local program development by using baseline data, processing and disseminating more information about effective practices, and analyzing programs in greater detail and from different perspectives.

Additional Chapter 1 Innovation and Reform

Schoolwide Projects

Wyoming currently has no Chapter 1 schoolwide projects.

In 1990-91 five schools were eligible for schoolwide projects. The following number of schools would be eligible for schoolwide projects if the low-income eligibility threshold were reduced from 75 percent to the following levels: 5 schools at 60 percent, 10 schools at 50 percent, and 25 schools at 40 percent.

Coordination with the Regular Classroom

Currently, all Wyoming schools are involved in developing performance-based curricula. The entire education community, including Chapter 1 teachers and staff, are involved locally with regular classroom teachers in developing a mission statement and determining goals and objectives for each subject area. Additionally, through on-site consultations, newsletters, and regional meetings, Chapter 1 teachers are reminded of the necessity of coordinating their activities with the regular school program and integrating Chapter 1 curriculum with the school curriculum.

The SEA has worked closely with the TAC and Rural TAC (RTAC) in arranging for a series of workshops and in-service education activities tailored to the expressed needs of Wyoming Chapter 1 teachers. Individual districts, particularly those involved in improvement projects, have also arranged for on-site TAC and RTAC consultation to address local needs. In addition, the state is transitioning from a transcript analysis process for determining teachers' qualifications for certification to a more comprehensive process based on institutional recommendations following completion of an SEA-approved teacher preparation program developed around competencies, experience, and skills in the appropriate subject field(s). In-service training, continuing education, and teacher evaluation are tied directly to the certification process and are designed to improve the quality of teaching both for regular classroom teachers and Chapter 1 teachers.

Statewide Coordination

Wyoming schools are traditionally independent. School improvement—the establishment of a statewide performance-based education system—mandated by the state legislature is in effect. Because of the small rural state population and cordial environment within and among schools, and communication between teachers, between schools and the LEA, and between LEAs and the SEA, program coordination has been readily facilitated and is considered routine in most schools across the state.

In some schools, it would be difficult to distinguish between improvement efforts sponsored by particular federal, state, or local programs because of the overlap.

In some schools, it would be difficult to distinguish between improvement efforts sponsored by particular federal, state, or local programs because of the overlap.

The SEA is coordinating data-collection efforts in an attempt to streamline the administrative/paperwork requirements at the local level. Each form used to gather information must be approved by the SEA Information and Technology Committee. All of the Chapter 1 forms have been revised to make them as clear and direct as possible.

The state has provided guidance to LEAs with regard to coordinating Chapter 1, special education, and bilingual education mainly through networking via telephone. Efforts to coordinate Chapter 1 with special education have centered around following the federal regulations to serve children with disabilities. In selecting limited-English-proficient (LEP) students for Chapter 1 services, the state has followed the federal guidelines concerning LEP children.

Making a Difference School by School

Program Improvement at Greybull Elementary School, Greybull

In an effort to improve its Chapter 1 program, the Greybull Elementary School has undergone a comprehensive self-assessment in each of the following areas: program leadership, curriculum and program design, school and classroom environment, classroom instruction, assessment and evaluation, and parent involvement. This team endeavor addresses Chapter 1 instructional issues and priorities based on assessed needs and has resulted in the development of a region-wide, cooperative, systematic approach to improving the training of classroom teachers in grades 3 through 7. The Strategies Intervention Model (SIM) enables teachers to teach more effectively by reinforcing learning. Parents are also trained in homework strategies. The most noticeable condition in this district is the impact of student mobility on success. Frequent moves during the school year have a negative effect on student progress. The SIM model is being implemented region-wide through a Chapter 2 Regional Outcomes-Based Program in an attempt to ensure consistent intervention among students who are considered at risk.